The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXVI, No. 3 MARCH, 1947

CONTENTS

The American Priest . *Archbishop Richard J. Cushing* 161

Rev. Francis A. Mullin, Ph.D.: In Memoriam *Maurice S. Sheehy* 171

The Seminarian's Confessor . *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 174

The Communists Come to Kian . *S. Russo, C.M.* 184

Paratrooper Padre: Part V . . *Francis Sampson* 199

Seven O'Clock . . . . . *Leo J. Trese* 210

The Diocesan Priesthood in the Catholic Church *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 212

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Indulgences of the Way of the Cross 226

The Workingman's Privilege 227

Our Stand against the Campaign for Euthanasia . . . 228

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States, $4.00; Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1947, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

Indulgences of the Church Unity Octave 230

The Obligation of the Communion Cloth 230

The Ablutions in Bination 231

Dalmatics or Folded Chasubles on Feb. 2, 1947 . . . 232

ANALECTA 233

BOOK REVIEWS

Morals in Politics and Professions,
by Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. 236

Exile in the Stars . . . . . *by James J. Donohue* 239

BOOK NOTES 240

TIMELY FOR

LENT *and* HOLY WEEK

Theology for the Mind and the Heart

The Atonement of Christ is God's Method of our At-one-ment with Him

GOD'S OWN METHOD

By ALOYSIUS MCDONOUGH, CP., STD.
with Preface by
ARCHBISHOP CUSHING OF BOSTON

"An Ought-to-be Best Seller"
—Thinker's Digest

READY FEBRUARY 15th

$2.00
(Postage prepaid on prepaid orders)

Order from your Catholic Bookmart
or
The Sign Press, Monastery Place, Union City, N. J.

A mine of up-to-date information for every Priest and Religious who has access to a file of THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW — Indispensable for the well-equipped library.

INDEX
of
THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW
Volumes 51—100

July, 1914 - June, 1939

A detailed reference volume of over 430 pages, 8vo, has a strong, long-lasting library binding in green cloth, stamped in gold.

$5.00 postpaid

THE CATHOLIC UNVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS
Washington 17, D. C.

THE AMERICAN PRIEST

I can think of no more pleasant theme on which to write than that suggested by the topic, "The American Priest." My only hesitation would be that, knowing and loving our priests so well, I might be accused of partiality and an enthusiasm not warranted by the facts.

Since the only geographical adjective acknowledged by dogma is that which localizes the See of Peter, how can we use a term like "American" priest? Does it imply divisions among the clergy of the world, a different priesthood under every flag? The Anglican Church, by English law established, implies just that; "the English Church in France," for example, would be a manifest contradiction, not to say a tremendous oddity. But the *Catholic* Church and the *Catholic* priest in America can be called the "American Church" and the "American priest" to the confusion of no one. An American priest is a priest of the universal Faith who lives and labors in America; he is a man who has integrated all that is best in the natural elements of the American way of life with all the supernatural essence and dignity of the Catholic priesthood.

It might seem that Christ, the Founder of the priesthood, in calling as He did for the renunciation of many natural ties, wished His ministers to efface their nationality. It is true that He Himself faced the necessity of preaching to a "Chosen People" a *supra-national* as well as a supernatural Church. When He called His Apostles, and implemented their calling with the appropriate grace of Holy Orders, it is true that He stressed the notion of their "going forth" with little reference, as far as Scripture tells us, to their conduct once they arrived at their destinations. But they could easily determine their course by observing His own priestly "way" among the people blessed by His personal ministry. Had He not told His disciples to "follow" Him; to be, as Paul tried to be, "all things to all men?"

Our Divine Lord during His years on earth paid faithful attention to the customs, habits, and traditions of the people among whom He worked. He wore the ordinary clothes, He ate the local food, He spoke the common language. He wept with particular affection over the fate of His capital city. He was loyal to the contemporary law of His land and to the precepts of His national

ancestors. His very birth occurred where it did in obedience to the "mandate that went out from Caesar Augustus." The people who saw and listened to Him found nothing strange or "foreign" about Christ. The only thing that made them wonder was His claim to be something more than what He seemed to be—one of themselves.

Beyond the Holy Land itself, however, it is obvious that the "good news" of salvation must come originally to all other peoples on the lips of strangers. But the Gospel itself was not strange; it appealed to the fundamental human nature of those who heard it; it answered the common yearnings of their hearts. The personal characteristics of the messenger, his nationality, his appearance, his manners, and his abilities, were no part of the message itself. And the seed once planted, due thanks being given to him who planted it, each nation raised Christian priests and people of its own. "Each in his own tongue," as it were, heard the wondrous works of God. And Catholicity, universal in its essentials, became, in non-essentials, as varied as the races that adopted it.

Henceforth it became possible to distinguish within the Fold, Italian priests, German priests, French priests, Irish priests, English priests, and all the others. So in this latter day we can speak without fear of misunderstanding of "American priests," priests of the same God as the others and ministers of the same Faith, but not losing thereby a whit of their legitimate national or racial individuality. By being sharers in a priesthood that is wider than America they do not cease to be Americans; indeed, history has proved them to be pre-eminent Americans ever since the first Mass was said under the protection of our nation's flag.

This paper is an attempt to describe what, in the opinion of one of their number, the priest in America should be. As have many others, I have often preached and written on the undeniable fact that the priesthood in today's world faces an unusually difficult but uncommonly stimulating challenge. The field in which we work has been amazingly cleared of many of the encumbrances that impeded the sacred ministry in other days. The dogmatic heresies of old, and the long-nurtured schisms, have ceased to have living interest for most of our contemporaries. Even dissidents from the Faith are less articulate in their "protests" than of yore. This silence may be an ominous thing; some-

times it seems to say that religious truths are no longer worth the labor of a controversy. Men have abandoned what were incorrectly called their "various beliefs" in favor of a great general denial, in practice if not in words, of the value of the supernatural. They have evolved a heresy that holds heresy itself as nonsense and a conviction that schism, in the theological sense, is a useless warfare against a unity that need never be.

We preachers and doers of the Word in the world today, far from congratulating ourselves on the fact that we have fewer deliberate adversaries, must convince ourselves also that we have fewer friends. We almost stand alone. We look about at sects called "Christian" and sorrowfully ask ourselves: how much longer will they continue even to bear the *Name* of Christ?

Our approach to priestly problems, therefore, if it is to be appropriate to a realistic world, must take new turns. The ancient "refutations" of heresiarchs fall on deaf ears today; the careful syllogisms of the scholastics are less willingly investigated by those outside the Faith, although their logic will survive as long as truth is truth. The priest of today must be equipped with even more. The warfare to be waged under the "Vexilla Regis," like any warfare, constantly develops new strategies and new types of champions.

No one can yet describe in what characteristic manner the priests throughout the world are responding to present-day circumstances and emergencies. We are confident they are responding in a truly heroic manner. I am familiar, of course, from first-hand reports, with the glorious work of the missionaries in far-flung fields; their methods show almost visible inspiration from on high. But I also know the priests of America, parochial and religious, and their reactions to these changing times, and any priest should be proud to be one of them.

We priests of America know our countrymen very well, which is a tremendous asset. Most of us were born here; most of us are from what may be called "typical" or "average" families. We know that our fellow-citizens have many natural virtues, a fertile field for the operations of that divine grace which we yearn to bring them. We believe that we can show the world an example of Catholicity, an example second to that of no other age or place.

We know that Americans have a veritable passion for "results;" they like things "that work." They are willing, in a good-natured,

casual way, to concede the virtues and successes of the past, but they are keenly conscious of living in the present and somewhat less certain than they should be that the past has any lessons for us. They are provident enough for the future, but the "future" that they plan for, is, I regret to say, very often a period which concludes at the grave. More than most people, I think, Americans are open to new things, but they ask without fail, as a kind of earmark of genuinity, what these new things "have to offer."

On the whole, this is an atmosphere which it is good to breathe. God Himself is glorified by people who "want to be shown," because He placed within our intellects that precise craving. His Divine Son showed a certain predilection for the "honest doubter," St. Thomas, the man who "had to be shown." He must be pleased by every honest question, because He knows that He ultimately is the complete and enduring answer. American people are definitely searching. We, their priests, know whom and for what they are searching. We owe it to them and to Him who made us priests to lead in that search. But our eyes must be open and our senses thoroughly awake.

I would suggest a program, in no wise original or new, that emphasizes four elements in the work of every successful priest; note that the first three of them concern the interior life of the priest himself. First of all, we must be devoted to prayer, not perhaps, fervent oraisons with uplifted arms, but a genuine pious effort to keep close to God. It is impossible to do God's work without God's help; we will not get the help we need unless we ask for it. "Seek and ye shall find," says the Master. For all the "hounds of heaven," God never promised that grace, *unsought*, will always seek us out.

American priests, like Americans in general, are men of action. They have brains and brawn and are not afraid to use both. On the whole, they are a healthy group, and, consequently, tireless. Many of them are veritable zealots in the cause; the zeal of God's House consumes them. The great progress of the Church in this country would prove this even if we did not know it from daily observation, and from our further knowledge of endless labors that fall under no observer's eye. But all this activity, all this "motion," would avail us little if it were not the activity of persons close to God. He is the "Unmoved Mover" of all things; our work partakes of His when we are united to Him; it merely

counterfeits it when we are not. *Prayer* and *more prayer* is the first element in our priestly program; to us more than to all other men comes the command: *Clama, ne cesses!*

But there was a Pharisee who *prayed*, in accents loud and utterances long; God rebuked him. Our second need, it seems to me, is to possess humility and charity of heart. A priest who is "proud," in the obnoxious sense of the word, is a blot on the landscape. Arrogance as ill befits us as mortal sin. Vanity makes stupid beasts of those called to a ministry not given to the angels. Readers of this *Review* need not be told of what humility consists. It is the state of mind that an honest man attains when he thoroughly "knows himself;" it permits him neither to grovel nor to walk on clouds. It is a triumph of grace, a knowledge and an honesty for which every priest should pray all the days of his life.

The American priest must have charity of heart. I think he has. The corporal works of mercy, commonly associated with the virtue of charity, are familiar to us all. This fortunate circumstance, however, is partly due to the fact that we have possessed the good things of this world in unusual abundance. In this situation, giving to the poor does not always pinch the giver. But "charity of heart," obvious love for other people, and for *all* people, is something more.

Charity of heart is such a *big* concept. By "heart," of course, I mean what the philosophers call "the will." This magnificent faculty desires to be united with, and enjoys the union with its "proper object"—the "good," which is another way of saying God and creatures as the images of God. Therefore, the American priest, or any priest for that matter, must stand out in his community as a recognized model of universal love before his preaching will be listened to or his counsels sought.

When I was first appointed to my present office I publicly announced as a very necessary policy which I proposed to make my own, that we oppose all the "anti's" in thought and word and deed. My experiences of the past two years have thoroughly confirmed me in this resolution. There is no room for antagonisms, personal or inherited, on the American scene. Above all, there is no room for bigotry or prejudice in the heart of an American priest. By a double counsel—the convictions that make us priests, and the principles that make us Americans, we are

solemnly committed to a life-long tolerance and brotherly love for all.

No personal merit, but our ministry, makes us "big people," at least among our own. We are indeed "big" when we ascend the pulpit. We have ready access to the press and can fill the printed page with inspiring and carefully chosen phrases. But when the tumult and the fury have died down, it is not our more or less satisfactory performances in these public places that will bring souls to Jesus Christ. It is rather our interior virtue, our habitual love of our fellowmen, manifested spontaneously and on unheralded occasions, to "difficult" people as well as charming people, that proves us less unworthy of the awesome office to which we have been called.

The early Christians, when life itself depended upon keeping their Faith a secret, time after time betrayed themselves by the outstanding goodness of their lives, particularly by their charity of heart. "See how these Christians love one another" was the admiring comment even of their persecutors. Today the spiritual life of untold numbers of "churchless" people may depend upon the demonstration by us personally that the Faith has made us better than those who have it not. The reputation of the Priesthood and the Church, the reputation of Christ Himself, of His holiness, His charity, is all in our hands today.

The third of the four points to which I have made reference, is, in a way, an extension of the second. Not only must we have charity in our hearts, but every element of our lives must give blameless witness to the truth of Faith, as the Apostles, the Confessors, and the Martyrs gave witness to it. Not without reason are their names invoked as we lie prostrate in the sanctuary on our ordination day.

It is not for me to search the hearts of my fellow-priests to discover their charity, their humility, their spirit of prayer. But I venture the opinion that nowhere in the world at any time has there been, generally speaking, a more genuine, holy clergy than is ours today in America. I do not ask for the holiness of canonized Saints; we are still in a place of trial, exposed to many temptations, all-too-conscious heirs of the sin of Adam. But we are also heirs of the wondrous priesthood of Christ which conquers those temptations and brings victory in those trials.

I call a man a holy priest who, although he may make mistakes,

rises again after them and resolves with God's grace to avoid them in the future. I call a man a pious priest who, in season and out of season, "sticks to his job." I ask for a priest who casts this world's contagion from him like dust from a garment; who calmly sights his goal and directs his steps resolutely toward it, plodding or running as his energies permit.

I pray for priests to whom "it is the Mass that matters;" priests whose kneeling benches never gather dust. We have all read of the man who after many years of employment was presented "the clock which he had watched so long." The laborers in the vineyard who disputed the justice of the Master's payment were typical "watchers of the clock." And I can think of no other reason for Christ's emphasizing this story than to administer a stern rebuke to their imitators down the ages. We priests are not as other men and we do not follow their standards. They quite legitimately sell their services, for a stated wage, to their fellowmen; we give ourselves and leave the wage to God. And I have no doubt that when God begins to reward us for our labors the recompense will far exceed anything that our most generous impulse would have allotted to ourselves.

Thus, as men of prayer, with love towards all, and as living witnesses to all that is good, we may proceed to perform that particular external work which has been assigned to us. There is a great point in this circumstance that priests do not select their own field of endeavor but are "assigned" to it. Sometimes, I think, too much talk is made about the "hardships of obedience." Those who make it seem to confound it with servility, the labor of a slave. Christ has said, and on our ordination day it is repeated in the Mass, "I shall not call you slaves, but friends." Obedience for religious motives is a joyous thing; it presents a program for our work that integrates it with the labors of all other priests. It implies a promise that we ourselves shall infallibly be successful even if the work apparently is not. We have merely said: "Here I am, Lord, send me." And he has sent us through the voice of our superiors. This lifts from the conscience of the priest or religious the misgiving that he may not be where God wishes him to be. It protects us from blame and frees us from worry. People in the world who have the complete direction of their lives must often envy us and count their supposed "freedom" a questionable asset.

Prepared in mind and heart, "commissioned," as it were, by divine authority, the priest enters his "public life." Nowhere in this wide world, I think, is that life so truly "public" as it is here in America. Nowhere does the priest have so much possibility of influencing public life for good.

The immortal Cardinal Gibbons, fifty years ago, doubted whether any age or country had ever presented a more inviting field for priestly labor than that which is provided in these United States, and he pleaded eloquently for all our priests to take advantages of the freedom which the Church enjoyed on these shores and the prestige which good priests could bring to her. He said:

> The word of God is not bound or shackled here as it has been elsewhere. No military satrap or State functionary is permitted to enter our churches in the capacity of an official censor, to arrest, fine, or imprison a minister of the Gospel for his conscientious utterances in vindication of social morals and in denunciation of official corruption.
>
> The Catholic pastor is sure to be heard with reverence, sympathy, and adhesion by the members of his flock; and many even of those that are not of the household of the faith, will often be attentive and respectful listeners, especially on extraordinary occasions.

This brings me to my last point, what I may call the "manners" of the Christian priest in regard to those among whom he is sent. I can sum it up in two words: *Be kind!* Kindness is not softness; it is not weakness. A man can rebuke another with the fury of the wind, and be as empty as the wind. A man can visit a tremendous rage upon a neighbor, and be an arrant coward. On the other hand, the surgeon's scalpel is an instrument of kindness when it inflicts a present pain to procure a lasting state of well-being.

It is easy to tell American priests to be kind because, as a rule, Americans are instinctively kind. Half the nations of the world have been the beneficiaries of our national kindness; sometimes—unkindest cut of all—they have laughed at it, only to succumb to its charms once more when further need arose. Our people's hearts are wrung at the thought of destitution anywhere. Even after we have conquered enemies we try to lift them to their feet again. "Not to hit a man when he is down" is almost a national motto. The lame, the blind, the halt, physically, mentally or morally, always receive a ready welcome at our door and exert

an irresistible tug on our heart-strings and our purse-strings alike. It would be strange, indeed, if our priesthood made us different in this respect from the people from whom we have sprung.

America is an athletic-minded nation. I am glad of it. Our boys carry into manhood, and into the priesthood, many useful lessons in dealing with the "adversaries" of their later life. If "the battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton," I think it safe to say that many a battle for the Faith is won in our schoolyards and athletic arenas. The contests in which athletes engage are merely simulated battles. The good sportsman struggles with an "opponent" whom, fundamentally, he likes and even loves. The tape is broken, the last ball is thrown, a whistle blows; the game is over and the "antagonists" go home, arm in arm.

The *bonum certamen* to which all Christians, and particularly all priests, are called is obviously more than a game. It is very real, and its outcome of transcendent importance. But the conflicts involved are against creatures for whom we are commanded to have an abiding love. Indeed this may at times be the most trying aspect of the *certamen*, this constant necessity to manifest in action that we appreciate the distinction in "loving the sinner while hating the sin." Prayerful priests can do it; humble priests can do it; holy priests can do it. And in the doing of it, their prayers become purer, their humility more profound, their sanctity more splendid.

Be kind! It were blasphemy to suggest that the *Pater Noster*, the prayer of God to God, was composed of elements casually put together by the Master when He gave it to us. But that prayer definitely makes our personal kindness the measure of the kindness which we may expect of God. "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive . . ."

Persons with retentive minds have been known to assert that if all the copies of certain famous writings were lost they could reconstruct them, line for line and word for word, from memory. We priests should so live that if the *Pater Noster* were to disappear from the earth, it could be written over again from the elements of our daily lives, and particularly that sublime passage—"as we forgive."

In these points, prayerfulness, humility and charity, blameless

living, and kindliness, I have attempted to describe what I feel the "American priest" owes to America and to his priesthood in this confusing and bewildered hour. I have expressed my belief that our American priests are daily paying this double debt. I write as a priest to priests, but if these lines should strike a layman's eye, let him join us in the prayer that we may pay this debt to the last farthing. *Oremus pro invicem!*

✠ Richard J. Cushing, D.D.
Archbishop of Boston

Fifty Years Ago

In the March, 1897, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* the leading article, contributed by Fr. M. F. Dineen, is an historical account of St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore, which had observed in 1891 the hundredth anniversary of its establishment. Listed as members of the present faculty are the famous Sulpician theologians, Fathers Tanquerey and Ayrinhac. . . . Bishop Hedley, O.S.B., of Wales, writing on "Modern Religious Controversy," recommends kindness and gentleness, instead of acrimonious argumentation, if one wishes to make converts. . . . Fr. William Stang (later Bishop of Fall River) recounts the foundation and the early history of the American College of the Immaculate Conception at Louvain, which was inaugurated on March 19, 1857. . . . Fr. S. M. Brandi, S.J., continuing his series on Anglican Orders, answers some objections to the Catholic teaching based on the form of ordination employed in the early Church and in some of the Oriental liturgies. . . The anonymous writer who calls himself 'Ο ΘΑΡΣΕΥΣ, writing on the method employed in the United States for selecting bishops, narrates that a few years previously a movement was set on foot in our land to advocate the election of bishops by popular suffrage. But the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, in a letter addressed to the American hierarchy, promptly pointed out that such a method is contrary to the established law of the Church, and under the particular circumstances would be most dangerous to the peace and order of the faithful. . . . The "Conferences" contain a brief account of the origin of the invocations "Blessed be God, etc." We are told that this formula of the divine praises was composed toward the end of the eighteenth century by a Jesuit, Fr. Felici, for a sodality of sailors, in order to counteract the tendency to use the Holy Name in blasphemy. Leo XIII, who was very fond of the prayer, increased the indulgences for its public recitation after Mass or during exposition of the Blessed Sacrament.

F.J.C.

REV. FRANCIS A. MULLIN, Ph.D.: IN MEMORIAM

The fine qualities of priestly character and of true scholarship were beautifully blended in the person of Rev. Francis A. Mullin, Ph.D., priest of the Archdiocese of Dubuque, for over ten years librarian of The Catholic University of America, who died on Jan. 2, 1947.

Born near Dubuque, Iowa, on Dec. 30, 1892, it was the great privilege of Fr. Mullin to know and be guided in his boyhood days by the first Rector of The Catholic University of America, Archbishop John J. Keane. It was the custom of Archbishop Keane to speak frequently about the University to the students at St. Joseph's, now Loras College. Through him Fr. Mullin became familiar with the writings of Bishop Spalding. The late Bishop Daniel Gorman encouraged the young student to study for the priesthood. Ordained by Cardinal Gibbons in 1918, Fr. Mullin first served in a parish which always had a special claim on his affection, the Cathedral parish. His funeral was conducted in this parish on Jan. 7, 1947. However, he was a member of St. Anthony's parish and a lifelong friend of the pastor, Msgr. Peter O'Malley, who spoke at Dubuque's last tribute to its priestly and scholarly son.

For sixteen years Fr. Mullin was a professor of history at his alma mater. However, the students knew him best as a confessor and spiritual director. He set the footsteps of many a young man on the pathway to the priesthood. He always had the humility of true greatness. In 1932, he completed at The Catholic University of America, under the guidance of its distinguished historian, Msgr. Guilday, his doctoral dissertation, *A History of the Work of the Cistercians in Yorkshire, 1131-1300.* More important than the content of this dissertation was the fact that, to complete it, Fr. Mullin had to visit some of the leading libraries of the world.

In 1934, at the request of Archbishop James Ryan, then rector of the Catholic University of America, Fr. Mullin decided to leave his many friends in Dubuque that he might devote himself to the world of books. For two years he labored under Dr. William Warner Bishop, of the University of Michigan, who encouraged him both to master the techniques of a new science and to become familiar with the great book collections of the world.

When Fr. Mullin was a student at The Catholic University of America, its scholars were using, to a large extent, other book collections, notably that of the Library of Congress. He felt that the prestige of The Catholic University depended upon scholars of the world coming to its library.

On assuming his responsibilities at the University in 1936, Fr. Mullin made a comprehensive survey of library facilities and collections. He felt that the University must be second to none in library efficiency. It is indeed a tribute to his judgment that the Trustees of the University gradually raised the annual budgetary allowance for the library from thirty thousand to over one hundred thousand dollars. The annual reports of Fr. Mullin to the rector of the University indicate that he laid the foundations of a greater library upon solid grounds.

Moreover, his interests were Catholic. He was concerned about every Catholic high school and every Catholic college library. He helped the *Catholic Supplement* to the *Standard Catalog for High School Libraries* and the *Catholic Supplement* to the Shaw *List of Books for Catholic Libraries*. He was consulted frequently upon the design of library buildings. Scholars from many countries were in correspondence with him. He was a contributor to *The American Ecclesiastical Review* and other journals. Even when his tireless energy had undermined his health, he could not resist the temptation to serve others.

Fr. Mullin will be remembered at The Catholic University first as a priest and then as a scholar. He was the friend and counselor of all. When illness confined him to his quarters, his confreres were drawn there by his kindly wit and his gracious courtesy to all. No problem was too great or too small to be encompassed in his solicitude. Living in the world of ideas and books, he realized that the world existed for men. During the last few weeks of his life he had the satisfaction of knowing that a new attack upon juvenile delinquency, which he thought the great problem of our day, was launched along lines he had suggested. Recently a great national leader who wished to speak on peace received from Fr. Mullin not only the idea but the words for his message.

In the last year of his life, Fr. Mullin was the channel through which help came to the libraries of the war-torn countries of Europe. One can only estimate the amount of help he was able to secure for Catholic universities of the continent.

The School of Library Science at The Catholic University of America was organized under Fr. Mullin's direction to train Catholics, particularly priests and religious, for this important educational labor.

It was one of God's special gifts to Fr. Mullin that he maintained his mental faculties up to the end of his long illness. The day after Christmas, he informed one of his colleagues that he would spend the next Christmas, he hoped, in Heaven. And he commented upon the joy that must reign there during the yuletide season.

The first priest the Archdiocese of Dubuque gave to The Catholic University of America, the late Monsignor William J. Kerby, once wrote what might be a fitting epitaph for his recently deceased confrere; "*The dignity of a priest lies in his obligations; the wisdom of a priest lies in his spiritual insight; the glory of a priest lies in his personal loyalty to Christ.*"

MAURICE S. SHEEHY

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

THE OPPORTUNITY FOR PRIESTLY LEARNING

I venture to affirm that there are few clergymen in the country, no matter how extensive their parish, how numerous their flock, how pressing their ministerial duties; no matter how much they may be pre-occupied by material constructions, or how deeply immersed in indispensable financial operations—there are few, I maintain, who cannot have at their disposal as much opportunity for earnest study as the Challoners and the Mannings and the Englands and the Kenricks could command in their day.

—James Cardinal Gibbons, in *The Ambassador of Christ* (Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1896), p. 224.

THE SEMINARIAN'S CONFESSOR

The priest who acts as regular confessor to a seminarian is charged with a momentous task. His responsibility is multiplied in proportion to the number of clerical aspirants that approach him regularly in the sacred tribunal of Penance. On his shoulders rests the spiritual welfare, not of one, but of many souls—perhaps thousands. The young man who kneels beside him, week after week, may be destined to fill an important ecclesiastical office—perhaps the episcopate—and the confessor's manner of directing him in his formative years may have a weighty influence on the way he will fulfill his duties. Accordingly, the seminarian's confessor must perform his function with a deep consciousness of the gravity of his obligations and a constant realization that he must one day render a strict account to the Divine Judge of the way in which he has performed the task of guiding a chosen soul during the years of preparation for the most exalted office that mortal man can attain.

The seminarian's confessor must, of course, act as judge, teacher, and spiritual physician toward his penitent, as in the case of anyone who enters his confessional. But, in addition, he has serious duties toward the prospective reception of Holy Orders by the young man. It is not, indeed, within his province to invite the candidate formally to the reception of the priesthood; that belongs to the bishop or (in the case of exempt clerical religious) to the major superior.[1] Nor has the confessor the right to command a young man to receive Holy Orders, even though he possesses the requisite qualifications and has received a call from the bishop.[2] This holds good even in the event that the confessor believes the seminarian is staying back because of unfounded anxiety and fear. In such a case the confessor could point out that, as far as he can see, the young man's diffidence has no solid basis; he can emphasize the dignity and the merit of the priestly vocation. But ever and always he must make it clear that the final decision to accept the bishop's call must rest with the cleric himself. A confessor who would unduly urge (or, *a fortiori*, command) a seminarian to enter the priesthood may have reason to regret his undue zeal in later years, however

[1] Cf. *AAS*, IV (1912), 485.

[2] Can. 971; 973, §2.

advantageous may have seemed the ordination of the young man at the time.

On the other hand, it lies within the authority of the confessor to deter from the reception of orders one who he sincerely believes would be better suited for some other state in life. At times, he can even forbid the young man to enter the clerical state (at least for the time being) under penalty of the refusal of absolution. This the confessor may do, even though all the seminarian's superiors, including the bishop, have no hesitation in admitting him to orders. This authority the confessor can exercise, not only when his penitent has been guilty of serious sin, but even when he has a deeply-rooted habit of certain venial sins which are liable to develop into graver transgressions with the passing of time, or when he exhibits certain traits of character which may be a serious handicap to the proper fulfillment of priestly duties. In the words of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, the confessors of seminarians have the duty of "imposing the obligation of withdrawing from the ecclesiastical state on those who show that they are not called."[3]

The chief defects of character justifying a confessor in bidding a young man to stay back from ordination[4] would seem to be reduced to four—scrupulosity, laziness, disobedience, and impurity. We shall consider each in detail.

(1) *Scrupulosity.* A man who is gravely scrupulous should not be permitted to receive Holy Orders, at least until he has substantially overcome this unfortunate trait of character. We are not referring to a transient attack of scrupulosity which may be occasioned by the proximity of ordination and which can be dispelled by prudent and kindly direction. We are referring to the case of one who has developed over the course of years a pronounced tendency to see sin where there is no sin and is unable to make definite decisions like a normal adult of his years and education. It is a risky thing to admit such a person to the priesthood.

One form of scrupulosity is particularly hazardous—that which centers about the virtue of purity. Let no confessor imagine that

[3] S. Cong. Ep. et Reg., *Normae pro seminariis Italiae, n.* 56.

[4] We are referring particularly to major orders. Greater leniency can be justified in the admission of a young man to minor orders; yet even in this matter the confessor can at times exercise his right of prohibition.

the chastity of a young man is better safeguarded by the fact that he is a scrupulant in this matter. On the contrary, the person who cannot undertake the normal actions and associations of daily life without being continually tormented with sexual temptations and impulses to which he fears he has consented is harboring a sex complex which, unfortunately, sometimes leads from the state of scrupulosity to the very opposite extreme. Prudishness is not identical with purity; and the seminarian who prays and receives the sacraments with the dispositions expected of one in his state, and who is sincerely resolved to give to God the full measure of love connoted by perfect chastity, should find comparatively little difficulty in practicing the angelic virtue.

Accordingly, the confessor of a seminarian who manifests a definite tendency toward scrupulosity should make every effort to bring him to normalcy. He should instruct the penitent in the principles of theology concerning doubts on the part of a person in his psychological condition, he should urge him to have more confidence in God's protection, and above all, he should insist that the young man obey literally and unhesitatingly the directions he receives in the sacred tribunal. This last remedy is particularly important, and the way in which it is accepted by the penitent may be the deciding factor of his admission to Holy Orders. For example, a seminarian receives minor orders, and immediately afterward begins to worry about their validity—perhaps because he fears he did not touch the instruments or perhaps because he doubts if he had the requisite intention. He explains his difficulty to his confessor, and the latter, fully aware that the fear is groundless, bids him stop worrying. If he obeys absolutely and allows no further anxiety on the matter to trouble him, he gives proof that any leanings to scrupulosity he may have are not dangerous. But if, despite the confessor's admonition, he returns week after week with new angles on his doubts about his ordination, there is grave reason to fear that his admission to major orders may be the beginning of an entire lifetime of torturing anxiety about the validity of his priesthood, climaxed perhaps by a complete nervous breakdown. Or, perhaps he will be a source of disedification to the faithful by repeating the forms of Baptism and Penance three or four times or by taking a quarter of an hour for the consecration at Mass. When a confirmed scrupulant is allowed to enter the priesthood,

his ministry is likely to become a terrible burden to himself and a cause of scandal to his people.

(2) *Laziness.* The priest must be a zealous man, one who is prepared to expend his bodily and intellectual energies in hard, self-sacrificing labor for the welfare of the faithful committed to his charge. One who is likely to seek primarily his own ease and comfort, contenting himself with the least possible amount of work, should be excluded from the reception of Holy Orders. The seminarian who devotes only enough attention to his studies to "get by" or who is inordinately devoted to recreation and amusements or whose vacation periods are nothing more than a round of social activities and "good times" must be admonished by his confessor to change his ways radically, else he would be acting rashly in entering the priesthood. Even if there is no mention of such faults in confession, it is the duty of the confessor to make inquiries, unless he is otherwise aware that the young man's conduct is satisfactory from the standpoint of diligence.

One type of laziness is particularly reprehensible in a seminarian—the *acedia stricte dicta* which consists in an indifference to spiritual things, or lack of genuine piety. It is not necessary that the candidate for Holy Orders manifest an ecstatic form of devotion. Indeed, such a type of piety may be only shallow sentimentalism that will pass away soon after ordination. The piety to be sought for in a seminarian as a necessary requisite for ordination should be of the type described by Pope Pius XI, as expected of every priest:

> We mean that solid piety which is not dependent upon changing mood or feeling. It is based upon principles of sound doctrine; it is ruled by staunch convictions; and so it resists the assaults and the illusions of temptation. This piety should primarily be directed toward God our Father in heaven; yet it should be extended also to the Mother of God. The priest even more than the faithful should have devotion to Our Lady, for the relation of the priest to Christ is more deeply and truly like that which Mary bears to her Divine Son.[5]

A youth's piety during vacation is a more significant norm of his genuine spirit than that which is manifested in the seminary. When he is at home in the summer, does he attend Mass and

[5] Encyclical *Ad catholici sacerdotii*, Dec. 20, 1935 (*AAS*, XXVIII [1936], 39 ff.); N.C.W.C. transl., *Catholic Mind*, Feb. 8, 1936, p. 56.

receive Holy Communion daily, or almost daily, or only once or twice a week?[6] Is he exact about the daily visit to the Blessed Sacrament and the recitation of the rosary? Is he willing and anxious to serve at sacred functions in his home parish? In this matter the seminarian's regular confessor should question his penitent in detail, when he returns to the seminary at the close of vacation. Even the boy in the minor seminary, though he cannot be expected to show the solid piety required of a young man approaching the priesthood, should nevertheless be characterized by a spirit of devotion that marks him as one destined for the dignity of sharing in the priesthood of Christ.

(3) *Disobedience.* Obedience is one of the most important virtues of the ecclesiastical state. On the day of his ordination, after offering the Holy Sacrifice for the first time, the priest kneels before the altar and solemnly promises reverence and obedience to his bishop or (in the case of the exempt religious) to his religious Ordinary. Unless he has already learned well the lesson of prompt, wholehearted obedience to his superiors, this promise will prove an empty formality. Usually, a seminarian who is gravely deficient in the spirit of obedience will be discovered by the authorities of the seminary, and will be dismissed, as the Code prescribes.[7] Yet, at times, for one reason or another, it is only through the sacramental forum that this grave defect of character will become evident, and in that event the confessor must take action, lest he be accountable before God for a disastrous priestly career.

However, it is not easy to judge a young man's spirit of obedience. A phlegmatic individual, who can readily adapt himself to seminary rules and discipline may actually be less solid in the virtue of obedience than one who has to make constant efforts to conform, even though the latter's transgressions are

[6] The Holy See has ruled that frequency of Holy Communion on the part of a seminarian shall not be considered as a factor in determining the progress of the young man in piety (cf. Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest*, II [Milwaukee, 1943], 213). But evidently this direction refers to those authorized to judge the external conduct of the seminarians. A confessor is surely not forbidden to decide against a young man's ordination when he finds him so devoid of love for the Blessed Sacrament as to omit Holy Communion frequently through sheer laziness.

[7] Can. 1371.

more frequent. Again, it may happen that in a seminary certain rules remain on the books, although their purpose is evidently no longer in existence.[8] The violation of a rule of this nature is certainly not so serious as the breaking of a rule which clearly has a definite purpose in the formation of candidates for the priesthood. Disobedience motivated by pride or contempt is much worse than that which arises from youthful levity; the transgression of rules by stealth and trickery is more serious than an open violation. A more severe judgment is usually due to the disregard of the few rules which the seminarian is supposed to observe in vacation time than to the failure to obey some of the many rules that bind him within the walls of the seminary. Because of the difficulty in evaluating correctly a seminarian's spirit of obedience, the confessor must allow the young man to come to him for a considerable length of time before attempting to pass a definite judgment on whether or not he is sufficiently grounded in this essential virtue.

(4) *Impurity.* The violation of chastity by a priest brings down more shame on his sacred state and is likely to produce more acts of sacrilege than any other type of sin. Hence, it is supremely important that the gates of the sanctuary be closed to anyone whose prospects of remaining chaste throughout his entire lifetime are doubtful. Among those to be excluded from the seminary, according to Pope Pius XI, is "whoever has a special tendency to sensuality, and after a long trial has not proved that he can conquer it."[9] By the very nature of the matter involved, it is the confessor rather than any external authority who usually finds out about this grave defect in a prospective candidate for the priesthood and is called on to pass judgment whether or not the young man may lawfully seek admission to the clerical state. On this point the confessor must be absolutely inflexible, immune to every other consideration save the immeasurable harm that is done by a priest addicted to the vice of impurity. Whatever good qualities a youth may possess, if there is no well-founded assurance that he will live a chaste life he must be barred from Holy Orders.

[8] Such rules are harmful in any institution. They should be explicitly abrogated.

[9] Encyclical *Ad catholici sacerdotii, loc. cit.*, p. 69.

The problem of a cleric aspiring to sacred orders when he has contracted the habit of masturbation and has not given proof for a considerable period that he has overcome it was discussed thoroughly by St. Alphonsus.[10] It is worthy of note that in his earlier years the Saint had admitted the probability of the opinion that such a man may lawfully receive Holy Orders with no greater dispositions than those necessary for the fruitful reception of Penance—that is, genuine sorrow and a firm purpose of amendment. But, in his more mature writings, St. Alphonsus definitely upheld the view that only after he has proved, by at least several months of chaste living, that he has rid himself of the bad habit, may the cleric in question licitly approach to receive any of the major orders. The reason is that the reception of a sacred order is not merely the reception of a sacrament (or of a sacramental, at least, in the case of the subdiaconate) but is also the acceptance of a state of life which demands proved holiness. Hence, such dispositions as would suffice for the lawful reception of the sacrament of Penance are not necessarily sufficient for the lawful reception of Holy Orders. This opinion has been approved by Pope Pius XI, as is evident from the quotation given above, and is now so commonly admitted by theologians that the easier view could no longer be safely held.[11]

How long a period of chaste conduct is to be regarded as sufficient to give the required assurance that a young man has broken the evil habit? Six months should be regarded as the minimum.[12] Yet even this cannot be taken absolutely, for in some cases a longer period is surely required before it is morally certain that the habit has been broken—for example, in the case of one who has been consistently falling in the vacation period, though not at other times. I am inclined to the view that in practice a proof of at least a year's duration must be demanded of a young man aspiring to the priesthood, who has contracted the unfortunate habit in question, before he can safely be admitted to the subdiaconate. This would ordinarily mean that he must prove himself for two years before receiving the priesthood.[13] If, after

[10] *Theologia moralis*, Lib. VI, nn. 63-78.

[11] Cf. Vermeersch, *Periodica*, 1928, p. 231 f.

[12] Cf. Damen, *Theologia moralis* (Rome: Marietti, 1939), II, n. 586.

[13] This does not mean that an individual lapse on the part of one who is not the victim of a *habit* of sin would necessarily bar him from the reception of

receiving a major order, he again falls into the habit, an even more definite proof of virtue would be required before he may ascend higher.

What has been said refers primarily to solitary sin. A habit of sin which involves another person must be judged even more severely. Indeed, if a boy or young man looking forward to the priesthood, even though he is only in the minor seminary, fell into the habit of consummated sin with another, he could hardly ever be permitted to continue his studies for the priesthood. Furthermore, not only the habit of completed acts of impurity, but lesser sins against the angelic virtue, such as the habit of frequenting indecent shows in vacation time or of reading "spicy" novels or of externally manifesting sensual affection toward friends of either sex, can constitute a sufficient reason for barring a young man from the reception of Holy Orders until he has given adequate proof of reform.

When a seminarian has failed to give the requisite assurance of continued chastity, yet will not promise the confessor to refrain from receiving Holy Orders in the near future, the priest is obliged to refuse absolution. Moreover, if a cleric confesses to a priest who is not his regular confessor, and a sin of impurity is included in the matter of his confession, the confessor is bound to inquire if this is an habitual occurrence, and also the proximity of the young man to Holy Orders. If he discovers that there is question of a habit of incontinence by one who intends soon to receive a major order, he too must refuse absolution unless he receives the promise that the penitent will defer his ordination until he has given satisfactory proof that the evil habit is conquered.

A youth in the minor seminary or in the early years of the major seminary, in whom one of the defects of character described above, or an analogous fault, is discovered by the confessor[14] should be treated kindly, and helped to correct his ways, if he

---

Holy Orders in the near future. It should be noted, too, that the theologians who treat this question admit the possibility of extraordinary sudden conversion which would give immediate assurance of the destruction of a bad habit. But such an exceptional case would border on the miraculous. Cf. Damen, *op. cit.*, n. 586, *in fine.*

[14] For example, the same norms would be applicable to a habit of drunkenness as are applied to a habit of impurity.

shows a genuine desire to acquire the qualifications required of a priest. But, if there is little or no improvement with the passing of the years, the confessor should inform the young man kindly but firmly that, as far as his judgment is concerned, the priesthood is not his vocation. In the major seminary a decision of this kind should ordinarily be possible, when the seminarian has been in the institution for three, or at most, four years. The realization that a diocese or order needs more priests should not enter into a confessor's decision. In the words of the Fourth Council of the Lateran, repeated by Pope Pius XI: "It is better to have a few good priests than a multitude of bad ones."[15]

The confessor's authority as regards the reception of Holy Orders is evidently only negative under ordinary circumstances, consisting in the right to deter a young man from receiving Holy Orders if he is unworthy of the clerical state. But, in reference to the preparation for ordination, the confessor's duty is quite positive. From the candidate's earliest years of preparation for the priesthood, he must urge him to greater holiness in anticipation of the great day of ordination. Whatever other guidance the youth may receive outside the tribunal of Penance, the regular confessor is still bound to give him positive help and direction. For the confessor has opportunities of learning the good and bad traits of the seminarian that are granted to no one else. If he merely absolves the youth week after week, he has not done his full duty. He must assist each individual seminarian according to his particular needs. The exhortation need not be lengthy, but it should be given regularly, in the form of a recommendation to a greater devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, or to the practice of humility or charity, or as a few words of gentle encouragement to one who has had some special difficulty. In the words of Pope Pius XI: "Confessors and spiritual directors . . . can have a great influence on the souls of the individual students, and with paternal firmness they should guide each according to his spiritual needs."[16]

It is indeed a terrible tragedy when a priest has been gravely unfaithful to his holy vocation, particularly when it involves open apostasy. His own soul is placed in the state that leads to

[15] Encyclical *Ad catholici sacerdotii, loc. cit.*, p. 72.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 70.

eternal damnation, a heavy cross is laid on the shoulders of his bishop or religious superior, often irreparable harm is done to the souls of many persons. We cannot claim that in every case there were indications of what was to come in the early years of the unfortunate priest. Sometimes one who in seminary days gave promise of a fervent priestly life eventually takes his place in the ranks of the fallen. But, undoubtedly in other cases the tragedy would have been averted if the youth's confessor had taken heed of certain unfortunate tendencies and bade him return to the world. If, through negligence or human respect a confessor consciously failed to do his duty in this matter, he has a terrifying account to render to God. To every priest who regularly hears the confessions of seminarians this thought should be a solemn reminder of the grave responsibility placed on him to make every effort that only worthy candidates be admitted to the priesthood of Jesus Christ.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.
The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

EGO QUOS AMO, ARGUO ET CASTIGO

O my Lord, how true it is that as soon as a person renders Thee some service he is rewarded with great trials! And what a priceless reward they are for those of us that truly love Thee, if only we recognize their value at the time!

—St. Teresa in *The Book of the Foundations,* chapter 31, from *The Complete Works of St. Teresa of Jesus,* translated and edited by E. Allison Peers (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1946), III, 192.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE AND TODAY'S PRIESTHOOD

Our society bears a greater resemblance to that of the early apostolic times than to that of the centuries when the faith was more common, during the beautiful period of the middle ages. To direct my own ministry I have read and meditated the Acts of the Apostles, and I have seen clearly that our models are there.

—Cardinal Mercier, in a congratulatory letter to Cardinal Gibbons, Sept. 25, 1911, quoted by Dr. Gustave Thils in *Mission du clergé* (Bruges: Desclée, De Brouwer, 1942), p. 174.

THE COMMUNISTS COME TO KIAN

A mission that is not generally well-known is the Vicariate of Kian (Kiangsi), China, assigned since 1920 to the Lazarist, or Vincentian Fathers of the Province of Turin, Italy.

The Lazarists, so-called occasionally because their first motherhouse was St. Lazarus in Paris, but officially known as Priests of the Mission, are of French origin, having had as their founder the famous seventeenth-century Apostle of Charity, St. Vincent de Paul. In America they are known as Vincentian Fathers.

Kiangsi has an approximate population of thirty million and is politically divided into about eighty sub-prefectures, ecclesiastically divided into five vicariates. The vicariate of Kian includes exactly eighteen sub-prefectures occupying almost one-fourth of the total area of the province.

The vicariate appears on the map almost in the form of a square. In the west, it borders the Franciscan vicariate of Hunan; in the north the French Vicariate of Nanchang; in the south, the American vicariate of Kanchow, and in the east the Irish vicariate of Nancheng. The eastern part is crossed from south to north by the river Kan, which is the principal natural waterway of the province.

The vicariate of Kian is a young mission hardly twenty years old, but already well-seasoned by events of great political and religious importance. The author has been privileged to be intimately connected with it during that time.

The years 1920-26, before the revolution, were years of almost continuous civil strife between the northern and southern factions. The north, led by Wu Pei-fu, and the center, or more exactly the five provinces led by Suen Chan-fong, wanted to dominate the rebellious Kwangtung, already the hotbed of the coming revolution, and thus accomplish Chinese unification. The fighting Kwangtung Province resisted all attempts at invasion and often took up the offensive against what they called the ancient feudal militarism of the War Lords. Kiangsi, and therefore our vicariate, were thus surrounded by opposing forces and in the midst of crossfire. Different armies often moved across it from either direction. Sometimes there would be an encounter, but ordinarily no great damage would be inflicted on the fighting armies. Instead, a great deal of suffering was often undergone by the population during the civil wars. All kinds of depredations were carried out, especially their

typical manhunts seeking personal extortion in a way that made the soldiers hateful to the people.

In those days the mission still enjoyed universal respect. Its name and prestige were high. It offered refuge within its walls, as an inviolable shelter, to the terrified people fleeing upon the arrival of the armies. I remember receiving at one time almost two thousand women, children and elderly refugees. Imagine such a mob trooping into the mission, not only with their most valuable belongings, but with almost all their movable chattels and sometimes their livestock—dogs, cows, and chickens. Our missions in those circumstances were almost like Noah's Ark.

The missionary was then regarded by pagans, Christians, and the local authorities as the "savior of the city," the "great father of the people," as the Chinese expressed it. That was a situation not sought or desired by him, a source of trouble, danger, and sacrifice, but entirely imposed by circumstances and eventually bound to further the interests of the mission, by manifesting its charity and gaining favor. As a consequence, there were hopes and signs of mass conversions.

THE RED AVALANCHE

The period between 1926 and 1935 was marked by the national revolution and the Communist persecution; years of storm and bloodshed for the vicariate.

It is well to bear in mind first that Communism in China is more a political than an economic question. It is not a strictly Chinese product, but rather a foreign importation, strictly resembling, like father and son, the Russian brand of Bolshevism down to its methods of propaganda. Communism filtered into China through the door unwisely and almost stealthily opened to it by the Nationalist movement.

China wanted to achieve the dignity of a nation on a par with all others. The famous revolutionist Sun-Wen, a Protestant convert and a Cantonese, fathered this dream for forty years of unwavering labor and summed it up in his Testament, which is still read today in all Chinese mass meetings. Neither this Testament nor any of his other works, up to the time when his better-known work on the subject of Triple Demism was published, contains Communistic ideas or even a reference to Communism.

After several trials of unsuccessful military insurrections, Sun-Wen came to the conclusion that he would not succeed in his intent to free and unify China without the support, open or secret, of a foreign country. He then sought that support in turn from Japan, America, France, and England, but in vain. All mistrusted this restless popular leader.

Russian Bolshevism was at that time (1923-27) in its first contagious stage, sending agents throughout the world and dreaming already of a world revolution. Its agents in China, Karakan in Peking and Borodin in Canton, proposed an alliance to Sun-Wen, who, still hurt from the cold reception given him by the other nations, accepted it with enthusiasm and deep gratitude. An echo of this enthusiasm can be traced in the conferences on Triple Demism which he was then (1924) delivering in Canton, and in which, categorically condemning Marxism, he exalts the Russian Soviet as a deliverer of downtrodden peoples.

The fact remains that without the help of Russia the Chinese revolution would never have succeeded. Correspondingly, Russian Communism abused and profited by its alliance with the Nationalist armies to spread its doctrines everywhere in China and to enforce them with might.

The National-Communist avalanche started from Canton in September, 1926, and, within a few months, through the provinces of Hunan and Kiangsi, reached the basin of the Yang-tze River. A Communist government, headed by fiery Eugene Chen, who threatened all foreigners in China, was formed in Hankow. Here the riff-raff spat with impunity upon English soldiers, who had orders not to fire on any account. Nationalist elation, brought on by easy successes, reached its peak with the fall of Nanking in April, 1927, where a group of foreigners, including the Jesuit Fathers Dugout and Vanara, were shamefully slaughtered. It almost caused immediate foreign intervention, which was exactly what the Russian Communists, working in the background, were expecting. But Chiang Kai-Shek, chief of the Nationalist army, sensed that such an intervention would have gravely, perhaps irreparably, compromised the success of the revolution. He did not hesitate to make his decision, severing connections with the Communists and constituting a new and strictly Nationalist government in Nanking. The Hankow regime tried to depose the young, daring leader, but caused its own downfall. Thus began the struggle between Nation-

alist and Communist parties which through alternate successes was to last until the prelude of the Sino-Japanese hostilities.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

It must be admitted that Communism in China, and particularly in Kiangsi, which was for ten years a Communist stronghold, showed great skill in propaganda by adapting perfectly its theories to the Chinese mentality. It must also be remembered that where Communism is in the saddle, no other creed or party is tolerated, and its own authority is imposed under the penalty of death.

To the well-educated class, mostly students of the present generation, it presented itself patriotically as the redeemer from the foreign yoke. To the workers it promised higher salary and less work. To the farmers it spoke of land-sharing. To the destitute, the most numerous class, it distributed food and other things stolen elsewhere, and canceled all debts by burning all evidences of title. To all it preached free love and abolition of all modesty; so much so that in certain places they held parades of naked men and women. It was common to see children accusing their parents and causing them to be arraigned before the court for immediate action. The deceived and confused mobs were under the spell of propagandists, who predicted that under the Hammer and Sickle there would be no necessity of buying a wife as before and that everybody would become rich without working because labor would be done by machinery instead of by man's hands.

With regard to any form of religion, but especially the Catholic Faith, Communism always and systematically assumed a hostile and violent attitude. Wherever Communism took root there was no place for religion.

The Communists I knew in Kiangsi may be divided into three classes. The smallest class was that of the true believers. Next was that of those who sought in Communism a means to an economic or national betterment, or to achieve a personal ambition or revenge. The largest class was that of the forgotten multitude cowed and herded dumbly into line by force.

RESULTS OF COMMUNIST CONTROL

To those who had occasion, as I, to travel in those years all over the regions where Communism held the whip, it was disheartening to see so many abandoned fields, countless houses burned or de-

stroyed, and the Kan river alive with wild birds where mercantile craft were plying before.

Another terrifying sight were the derelict refugees of Communism. At times they moved by hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands. Companies of them would pass by in filthy and tattered clothing, emaciated by starvation, and vermin-ridden. With their physical suffering they also endured a burning moral suffering. Those poor people who had never left, and might never have left, their homes, were it not for Communism, were enduring exile without the possibility of seeing again their native places or receiving news of the whereabouts of their own scattered kinsfolk. Hunger, cold, disease, struggles, privations of all kinds and heartaches were playing havoc among their ranks. The Catholic Mission, wherever it had not been compelled to close its doors, as, for example, in Kanchow, curtailed its other charitable functions to take in as many refugees as possible, but it was like pouring a bucket of water over a raging fire. I witnessed many refugees standing all day long at the door of the Kanchow mission, begging to be let in, and kept out only because it was impossible to admit them all.

Since the remotest ages, family love and filial piety have been the greatest pride of the Chinese. Communism has also accomplished the destruction of this mark of nobility. I know the case of sons, who, in order to prove themselves good Communists, accused and caused the death of their parents or forced them to hang themselves. Among lesser blood relations that was an everyday occurrence.

What is most striking, however, is the scorn in which human life is held by the Communists. At times the number of executed persons was so great that bodies were buried barely beneath the surface or not at all. Prowling jackals would come at night to unearth and consume them. I often saw them in the country, singly and in packs, feeding on human bodies. When the execution was near the river, the process was easier. The bodies were tossed into the water and floated downstream for days in a grisly procession. Previously, Kiangsi had no official executioners, but in the days of the Reds, they were countless. When murder was to be committed the Communists competed for the gruesome privilege. They would brag among themselves of having killed twenty, thirty, or even a hundred people. It was frightful to see youths growing up

with those murderous instincts. I knew a boy hardly sixteen years of age who had killed more than sixteen men.

This killing was not all done in the heat of battle or for idealogical reasons, but very often for a small private revenge, futile motives, suspicion, or even less. I recall the case of a woman convert who was killed during a Red retreat because she could not walk fast enough, and the case of a pagan woman who met the same fate because, fearing reprisal from the Whites, she had dared to erase a Communist sign from her wall. Human life, it was openly said, is not worth any more than that of a dog. And what a sinister technique was often employed in the practice of murder! Some were slowly burned at the stake after kerosene had been poured over them; others had bamboo nails driven under the fingernails and toenails. A woman convert, captured by the Reds, because she had a son in the White army, underwent a deadly torture two days, in which her ears, nose, fingers, and toes were cut away a little at a time to the great enjoyment of her torturers.

How many people were killed by the Reds in Kiangsi? This is the official report made by Chiang Kai-Shek himself to the Nanking government in November, 1934: "Under Communist domination of two-thirds of the 81 sub-prefectures, almost 6,000,000 people lost their homes and more than 1,000,000 innocent people were deliberately murdered."

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

The years of revolution and Communist domination were years of suffering for our vicariate, which is in the very heart of Kiangsi. A real religious persecution was unloosed upon it in 1925, beginning with the Wanan mission. Its first leader was a Wananese named Tsen Tien-yu, meaning, ironically enough, "heavenly order."

I knew Tsen in 1921, having seen him come to our residence in Wanan to take French lessons from Fr. Nuzzi, who was then our district supervisor, He was tall and slender, pale and quiet, one of the many restless students who were absorbed in atheistic materialism and became easy prey to the most radical theories. In 1923 Tsen went to study at the University of Peking, where the Russian ambassador Karakan was secretly engaged in Communist propaganda. Tsen became one of his first and most zealous pupils and in 1925 returned to his land without a degree, but in charge of Communist propaganda for all

of Kiangsi. The Communist undermining had to precede, here as elsewhere, the actual outbreak of the revolution.

The first Communist cell in Kiangsi was then formed by Tsen in Wanan, simply as an anti-Christian association, but directly connected with the central office in Peking.

At that time the Wanan Catholic mission was well developed. Through the activity of my predecessors, the zealous Fathers Wathe and Nuzzi, and the aid rendered by the mission to the Christian and pagan population during the years of civil strife, we had gained a position of authority and general confidence. Our territory had more than twenty schools and chapels. Adult baptisms amounted to several hundred each year. The number of converts had been doubled within a few years and it stood at more than three thousand, with between seven and eight thousand more being given instructions. Our staff of three missionary priests, five sisters and about thirty catechists and lay teachers, could not keep pace with the remarkable growth. A wonderful future seemed to be ahead.

So much prosperity was bound to arouse the full hatred of Tsen and his group. This was the first and principal cause of the persecution. The rest were mere pretexts, as, for example, the donation to our mission of a plot of ground on which they had cast their eyes, and similar small incidents. Tsen himself, in writing to educated friends, who reproached him for his ingratitude toward the Catholic missionary who had contributed so much to the welfare of his country, had to say: "I do not fight the man but the idea that he represents. Communism does not allow religion."

Almost all the schools of our territory became hotbeds of anti-foreign and anti-religious propaganda. Leaflets, pamphlets, lectures and even public shows were widely used to discredit the mission and incite general hatred. However, there was relatively little damage done in the first two years of this campaign of slander and threat, partly because the anti-Christian association was declared illegal by Governor Sun Chuan-fang, and also because the mission was highly organized.

Then came the revolution of 1926. Tsen and his party seized power at once and set up the first Wanan local "soviet" aiming principally at the overthrow of the Catholic mission.

First, the Christians were deprived of all civil rights and systematically excluded from any public or private office. If they dared

to bring up a case before a court and were identified as converts, their case was lost. To obtain admission to any simple farm or labor union they first had to sign a written declaration of apostasy. Their homes would be kept under watch in the evening to discover whether they still said their prayers (the Chinese Christian, even if alone, ordinarily prays aloud). If caught in that "criminal" act, they were taken before the soviet, bound, beaten, and fined. Their homes were suddenly ransacked to find any incriminating proof, such as rosaries, pictures, prayer-books; such things were destroyed in public bonfires. "There goes your God up in smoke," sneered a young student to a woman convert, who answered him: "There will always be God until you have burned heaven." Squads of revolutionists would suddenly break into chapels and halls to hold up our religious services with shouts, threats, and insults. Day by day they became bolder and more insolent.

The prominent Christians of several towns were jailed under various accusations; if these charges were proven false, they were still kept in jail and abused because they refused to apostasize. One of our converts, Nicholas Hoang, achieved fame under those circumstances and was called the "iron dog" for his unflinching loyalty to the Faith.

In a public speech on Jan. 1, 1927, the chief of the local soviet, Ko Li-sin, made the following statement: "The Christians of the Wanan territory are considered by us a public menace. Almost one-tenth of our population is infected by their doctrine. We swear to destroy them and to that end we shall use any means, just or unjust, lawful or unlawful."

Alas, those were not empty words! Practically all the schools and halls scattered throughout the territory were immediately destroyed and burned. We missionaries, all gathered in the central residence of Wanan, found ourselves beseiged. Whenever a public demonstration was held in the public square, they came to the mission shouting: "Down with the Catholic mission," and showered the building with stones. We feared to go out, not only in the country, but even on the city streets.

On Easter Sunday of the same year, 1927, they prevented us from holding the celebration in the principal church of Wanan and, in fact, we were able to celebrate only one Mass. The same night the local soviet broke into the only branch chapel we had left, Leang-

Keo, just outside the city of Wanan. They brutally laid hands on the missionary Fr. Joseph Hu and his young catechist, Louis Lo. After three days of humiliations, torments and scourging, and after the travesty of a trial, the priest and his companion were charged with being anti-revolutionist and as such were shot to death outside the walls near the southern gate of the city. Such was the beginning of a long and bloody persecution, first among the Christians and later also among pagans, although not always for the same reasons. This was the "first bloodshed" among the million innocent victims of Communism in Kiangsi, which is mentioned by Generalissimo Chiang in his official report. It was on April 20, 1927.

Father Hu was my co-worker. From the Wanan jail, on the evening of April 19, he wrote me the following note, which was delivered to me only the day after his execution:

> Because I loved God and my neighbor I have been jailed by these devils. The night of April 18 I was twice given 50 lashes. Do not be disheartened, my Father, because I have already prepared myself for the martyrdom. However, I ask of you, Father, that you have the faithful pray for me so that God may give me the necessary strength. After my death I shall see you all in Paradise where eternal happiness will be ours. This Leang-Keo soviet had for a long time wanted to take over or destroy our church and our residence. My hands are tied.

The final act of the tragedy that was to lead our martyrs to their death lasted several hours. First there was a reunion of all the new soviet organizations: workers, farmers, women, a great number of students, several thousands in all. Then the two condemned were taken out from the prison to be led at a fast trot to the execution ground. Even at that last moment Fr. Hu turned to the sub-prefect to counsel him calmly to act according to justice. The official's only answer was to tear the clothing from Fr. Hu and his young companion, leaving them only in scant underclothing and to order that they be bound. Upon realizing that no hope was left on this earth, the priest then turned all his thoughts to God, exclaiming: "Jesus, Mary and Joseph, save my soul!" which is a common invocation among Chinese Christians. And he prayed steadily throughout his long and sorrowful *via crucis*.

The students and professors who surrounded them and flogged them continuously with reeds, derided them saying: "Since he calls

upon Jesus, why does not Jesus come to free him from our hands? Is it necessary that these people so stubbornly pray until they have to die?" After they arrived at the place of execution, Fr. Hu was shot twice, which left him in agony for several hours before he finally died. Of the two shots fired at young Louis, the first one missed and the second one only wounded him on a shoulder. As time was getting short, he was buried alive, care being taken, however, not to untie him, while the bonds of Fr. Hu, who was dead, were unfastened.

The Red occupation of Kiangsi reached its highest point in 1930. In October of that year our vicariate had become a vast surging Red tide. About forty different properties had been sacked or destroyed. Almost all the priests had taken refuge in the nearby provinces or fled alone to the mountains. The city of Kian, center of all our works, and occupied by the White forces, was left as the last island of refuge. But it too was to fall suddenly, almost unexpectedly, on Oct. 4, after having withstood five sieges by the forces of Chu Teh. Monsignor Mignani, accompanied by Fathers Barbato, Capozzi, Purino, Thieffry, DeJenlis, and Sister Leport, Superior of the Daughters of Charity, with four other Sisters, were all taken prisoners by the Reds. All our works were annihilated by that catastrophe.

One of the participants in that drama has recounted his capture as follows:

"On October 4 near 11 o'clock at night we could still hear the sound of rapid gunfire. I opened the curtains and saw that the defensive line of the Whites was afire and deafening shouts could be heard. The Reds had entered Kian. I gave the alarm to Monsignor Mignani, Father Barbato and Father Thieffry, who were asleep. Together they hurried out into the darkness, through the back gate of the garden and toward the house of one of our servants in search of a hiding place. At midnight the shooting had ceased and only dogs could be heard barking. Our defenders, General Teng and his troops, were quietly fleeing on boats made ready in advance.

"Next morning, Sunday, October 5, hordes of Red farmers rushed from all sides into the city to hunt out those who had refused to join their associations. Blood was shed in torrents. Heads fell by the hundreds— and this was only the beginning.

"We learned that morning that Sister Superior Leport and

her Daughters had been caught and taken across the market-place to the general headquarters of Pan-te-fe, which was at the seminary of Petang. A while later they told us that they had been able to pay a temporary ransom of three thousand dollars and were led back to the hospital to take care of six hundred wounded Red soldiers.

"Father Purino, unaware that the Reds had entered the city, was also caught this morning while going from the seminary to say Mass at a nearby house of the Daughters of Charity. He was taken to jail and held for a twenty thousand dollar fine because they had found in his room a typewriter and a camera, positive evidence of his being a capitalist.

"Monsignor Mignani and his pro-vicar have also been found in the house of the catechist Hu. They were bound and taken away, later marched through the large market-place of Kian. His Excellency was beaten with an iron rod, while Father Thieffry was stripped to his waist, and threatened with death. The Reds expect a large ransom for them. They are confined now in the convent of St. Anne.

"Father Barbato and I were hiding in an upstairs granary under the tiles. From Sunday the 5th until Friday the 10th we suffered continuous alarms. Three times the Reds came up to the granary and it was a miracle that they did not notice the small door camouflaged with a board and a bundle of sticks. At last we decided to get out at night and join Monsignor Mignani and Father Thieffry at the convent, especially in view of the fact that Father Capozzi, after shaving his beard and making himself look like a patient, was able to enter the hospital in a wheelchair. The convent, being an annex of the hospital, seemed to us a relatively safe refuge from the spears of the Red farmers.

"We received news that two Chinese priests had also been captured: Father Tcheng, pastor of the cathedral, and venerable Father King, my co-worker at the seminary. Of the foreign-born staff of Kian, Father Purino was the only one missing from the convent. From his jail we received notes that sounded like his final words: 'They are asking me for twenty thousand dollars and because I do not have it I shall be put to death tomorrow. I am preparing myself for martyrdom.' The morning of the 11th, upon the advice of our Dr. Tcheng, we believed it advisable to write a

letter to Governor Yang asking protection for Father Purino and ourselves. The answer came the same evening.

"A detachment of twenty Red soldiers, armed to the teeth, came to the door of our convent. Before they could crash it with their rifle butts we rushed to open it. They grabbed us at once and proceeded to search through our clothes, taking our watches and everything of value. The man in charge said: 'Never mind, we shall return them after. It is only to make sure that you carry no weapon.' They took us outside and made us wait. We thought that they were going to take the Sisters too. Instead it was just a house search in order to pick up valuables and anything that they liked.

"We were taken away, this time without bonds, through an overcrowded market-place. Our march was watched by drunken soldiers, red lancers, evil-mannered women who mocked us and looked highly pleased. Luckily Father Barbato and I had been able to shave ourselves the day before with a Chinese razor. At least they could not have fun in pulling out our beards. After twenty-five minutes of fast marching, we came to the eastern market where the Red troops' headquarters was, and we were told to go to a small upstairs room of an old shack. Being thirsty and starved, we asked the sergeant in charge to give us something. He came back after a while to hand us, as an appetizer, the following message from Governor Yang: 'You are now our prisoners and you will not leave this place until you have paid us a million dollars.'

"We smiled, tried to convince him of the mistaken idea they had of us, but it was all in vain. 'If you haven't the million dollars, demand it from your imperialistic governments,' replied the colonel. When we insisted that we were not the agents of any country, but priests of a universal religion, he smiled dryly and skeptically and left. No doubt he was overwhelmingly pleased with the rich booty: five European priests besides Father Purino already under custody, and five foreign Sisters!

"On Sunday, October 12, under the pretext of going out to secure money, Father Barbato was allowed to leave, accompanied by a soldier. He went by the prison of Father Purino, and after some negotiations succeeded in having him transferred to our prison. It was better to be all together. Imagine the emotion he felt, upon being received into the arms of Monsignor, after those three perilous days between life and death. He was already sentenced to

execution, like many other fellow-prisoners whom he saw taken out but who never returned."

Here we end the notes from the diary of our brother Missionary.

Two weeks after the conquest of Kian, the Reds, fearing a counter-offensive by the Whites, drove our prisoners across to the right bank of the river, and took them along when later they retreated towards the mountains of Ton-ku.

We actually despaired for many months of being able to rescue them. The Red demands were so exorbitant that it was impossible for us to meet them. Besides the million dollars, they also demanded from us I cannot recall how many field guns, machine guns, rifles, munitions, radio stations, medical supplies, etc. But Providence was watching over us.

In December of that year, the 18th division of Nanking, after having recovered Kian, daringly ventured into the Ton-ku mountains where the Reds were hiding and holding our captives. During a sudden troop movement between fighting engagements, our people were left alone for a brief time in a shack at the bottom of a valley. While looking around them they soon noticed White sentries on the crest of the mountain. They wanted to shout to make themselves known, but the distance and the fear of being heard by the Reds counseled them not to. They resorted to a signal; that of the Cross.

Sister Larmichant took out her white nurse's apron; from a red blanket they cut two strips of cloth which they sewed crosswise on the apron, and fastened this flag to a long bamboo cane. With this improvised Red Cross flag, Fathers Thieffry and Purino climbed to a higher point and waved it toward the White sentries at the top. At first they were not noticed, but the two continued waving silently and confidently until the soldiers' attention was attracted by the strange sight, and slowly, cautiously they came to investigate. Such was the beginning of their liberation.

The Kian mission had lost during those times absolutely everything, but no loss could be felt more than the loss of our Chinese priests killed by the Reds. Fr. Paul Tcheng was the pastor of the Kian cathedral, a cultured and pious priest, son of a martyr. In fact, the Boxers of 1900 had torn out his father's heart. Fr. Tcheng was killed, his chest pierced by a lance, not far from his own cathedral. The old and likable Fr. Kin was a veteran of all the persecutions that for half a century have been sweeping at intervals upon Kiangsi. During those persecutions he

would never flee and hide himself away as the European missionaries were compelled to do, but, being a native, he would disguise himself as a peddler and go about visiting the scattered Christians, sustaining their faith. The day before his death, he said to the woman convert who brought him food in his prison: "You will not need to come tomorrow as I have been condemned to death. I have already made the sacrifice of my life and I am glad to die for God and the Mission." Those were his last words that came to our knowledge. Owing to the terrible confusion existing at that time, it was not possible to find out exactly, even much later, where and how he was executed. We have not even been able to find his body.

In the years that followed the capture of Kian, the government of Nanking sent new and more seasoned troops into Kiangsi to reoccupy the most important centers. On our part, we hastened to return to our missions in order to rebuild the numerous ruins. The work of restoration was proceeding satisfactorily when a new calamity befell us in 1933.

The mission of Lin-Kiang, in the extreme north of the vicariate, had been, until then, the safest and most tranquil of all. Fr. Giacomo Anselmo was in charge of it. On the eve of Christmas of that year, a band of Reds, two or three thousand strong, who had been foraying everywhere in spite of the Whites, struck suddenly at the city of Lin-Kiang. Fr. Anselmo, being most anxious to save the Sacred Host and to give warning to the Sisters of St. Anne, could not get away in time. He was caught by the Reds while attempting to ferry across the river to find safety on the opposite bank. In Lin-Kiang he had a large and beautiful orphan asylum and a home for the aged. When the children and the old people saw this benefactor, on whom they depended for a living, in the hands of the Reds, they threw themselves at the feet of the captors begging for his freedom. Neither their prayers nor tears, nor the care and service which Fr. Anselmo gave to the wounded soldiers, brought any result.

We do not know the exact circumstances of his death. It is sure that he was stoned by the Reds on a mountain near Hunan, when they were routed by the regular troops. Poor Fr. Anselmo, on account of illness, could not keep up with their flight. His body was left unburied and only long afterward was given a hasty burial in a shallow grave.

CONCLUSION

The trials of Kian are not over, and the final word cannot be said. Be that as it may, the vicariate of Kian is a mission worthy of one's love, especially the love of those who labored and suffered in it, because of what it meant in the past and what it promises for the future. The sweat and blood of so many of her sons have not been shed for naught. The trials will end and the sweat and blood will again bring forth magnificent blossoms.

S. Russo, C.M.

Turin, Italy

THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN RULERS

If Christian Princes and their laws deviate from the law of God, the Church has authority from God to judge of that deviation, and by all its powers to enforce the correction of that departure from justice. I do not see how any man who believes in the Revelation of Christianity can dispute this assertion.

—Cardinal Manning in *The Vatican Decrees in Their Bearing on Civil Allegiance* (New York, 1875), p. 53.

THE JUDGMENT OF GOD

He judges us by our inward religious acts, which necessarily go for nothing with men. He judges us by the fructifying of His own gifts within us, a very slight portion of which ever becomes visible to men, and even that portion only partially visible. Moreover, He judges us as He sees us in His Son. He judges us by the love which Mary, angels, and saints have for us. And finally He judges us with all our good ever collectively before Him, while our evil is interrupted by frequent absolutions, and our sins supernaturally effaced by the Precious Blood, so that by the laws of His own redeeming love He cannot see them in the same way that men see them. Thus we are most reasonable in preferring rather to be judged by God than by men.

—Frederick William Faber, in *The Creator and the Creature* (Baltimore: Murphy and Co., 1857), pp. 350 f.

PARATROOPER PADRE

[Editor's Note: *This is the fifth in a series of articles made up of excerpts from letters written to members of his family by Fr. Francis Sampson, Chaplain with the 101st Airborne Division during World War II. The fourth installment, which appeared in the February, 1947, issue of this* Review, *ended with the approach of the Russian troops to the German camp where Fr. Sampson was a prisoner of war.*]

PART V: LIBERATION

Each night during the month of April I would slip out of my room after the men had gone to sleep, and would take the radio out of its hiding place in the pulpit. While a couple of boys kept watch at the door of the barracks, the American "Man of Confidence" and I listened to the BBC for Allied instructions to prisoners of war. Our instructions were few but specific. We were not to make any premature attempt at mass break or escape, for it would be foolish to lose lives now with assured freedom so close at hand. If the German guards fled, the ranking officer or non-commissioned officer was to take charge of the discipline and order of the group. "P.W." was to be painted in large block letters on top of each barracks, as were the Russian symbols for prisoner of war. A large "P.W." was to be marked out with stones or anything recognizable from the air in the largest open space in the prison camp. Any prisoner violence against German civilians was strictly forbidden, and German soldiers turning themselves over to Allied prisoners were to be held and given over to the force that liberated the camp. Every precaution was to be taken to avoid prisoner casualties of battles that might take place near and about the camp. Allied flags were to be flown above the camp as soon as the Germans were helpless to prevent it. Each night that we listened to the radio, the Russian artillery's muffled "woompf woompf" in the distance became more and more distinct, coming closer and closer.

Russian planes flew over the city of Neu-brandenburg and over the camp and dropped thousands of leaflets designed to terrify the German civilians; which they did very effectively. One of the pamphlets simply stated in German, "Rokosovski is at your gates." The reputation of Rokosovski's army was enough to

panic the Germans, and the roads were soon jammed with German wagons loaded with the most cherished of family possessions, with children and old people, heading west hoping to escape the Russians, and preferring anything to falling into their hands.

Many of the guards in the camp deserted, and fled in the direction of the American lines. Some of these asked me for letters to their future captors, stating how kind they had been to the Americans. A few of these had been decent, and a couple of them actually ran great risks to help us. To these I gave notes telling how they had aided us, and I sincerely hope that this benefited them. About a dozen guards, including the camp Commandant, turned themselves over to the prisoners and were locked up in the stone "block-house." The small garrison of the town dug in and prepared to defend it. We were busy digging trenches to take cover in as soon as the Russians began to shell the town. The events of the next few days were as terrible as I have ever seen or hope to see.

About midnight of April 28, the Russian tanks started coming in; the roar of the tanks coming from all sides was terrific. The opposition that the Germans were able to put up was almost totally ineffectual; as a matter of fact, the Russian infantry riding on the tanks (about fifteen or twenty to a tank) killed almost as many of their own men as they did the Germans. A couple of tanks, as they rolled into town, pushed down the barbed wire fences and the guard towers of the prison camp. The Russian soldiers seemed to be wild men; with "squeeze-boxes" and banjos strapped to their backs, and firing their rifles and tommyguns in every direction, they looked more like the old Mexico revolutionaries out on a spree than the army of one of the great powers of the world. Most of these soldiers were oriental or Mongolian in appearance.

Within an hour after their arrival, Neu-brandenburg was a sea of flames, which rose higher and higher as the night passed. It burned all the next day and there was scarcely a building that was not razed to the ground; the Catholic Church, strangely enough, was almost the only large building preserved. The Germans had a large army hospital about a quarter of a mile from the prison camp and it was packed with wounded; it was the first building set afire, although I was unable to find out for sure

whether the wounded had been removed or not. The heat from the burning city became intense and lighted the camp as brightly as daylight. The Americans kept calm and in perfect order during this time—something that could not be said for the French, Italians, and Serbs, who bolted the camp in mobs and went to loot the city. The Russian prisoners of war, of whom there were only 3,000 remaining alive out of 21,000 that had been registered in the camp, were quite oddly the only prisoners not particularly happy to be liberated. Each of them was tossed a rifle and told to get up to the front quickly. The Russian army doesn't believe that those who surrender to the enemy should be treated humanely. The Russian doctor and several others who were accused by their fellow prisoners as collaborators with the Germans were immediately shot. The German Commandant of the camp was taken up the hill to the cemetery, forced to dig a hole and was shot and his body dumped into it.

The next day a Russian General came to the camp. He asked for the American in charge, and the boys brought him to my room. I offered the General a cigar, a couple of boxes of which had recently come through under the Red Cross label. The General thoroughly enjoyed the cigar and the coffee I served him. I sent for an American soldier who spoke Russian, and the conversation with the General became very interesting and enlightening. He said that the cigar was the best he had ever smoked and the coffee by far the best he ever drank. After trying one of his own cigarettes I had no cause to distrust the compliment. He said that he would send "something good" up to me. A Russian soldier brought that "something" up the next day. It turned out to be a big crockery jug of vodka, one whiff of which was more than enough for me. The General told me how sorrowful all Russians were that President Roosevelt had died, that they considered him a great friend of Russia. He praised American equipment very highly, and said that in his opinion the Russians could not have held out had it not been for American help in equipping the Russian Army. This was obviously true, for almost every piece of equipment that we saw the Russians use was American; they used Sherman tanks for the most part, and our two-and-a-half ton trucks, our jeeps, and our armored cars were all employed almost exclusively. The Russian fighter planes were all Bell Airacobras, a plane that American pilots considered obsolete and

refused to fly. During the course of our conversation the General drank at least ten cups of coffee, and showed no signs of quitting until I had emptied the second pot in his cup.

A political commissar was brought into the camp, and he immediately called a meeting of the ranking officers of all the nationalities in the camp. He was a fine looking man, well mannered, and extremely intelligent—one of the best linguists that I have ever heard. He told us that we would remain in the camp until contact was made with the American lines. He gave us our instructions in French, Italian, Polish, Dutch, and in flawless English. He likewise said that our countries would be notified immediately that we had been liberated; the Americans (and only the Americans) might write one letter apiece to their families and these would be flown to American lines; food would be provided in abundance; transportation would be provided as soon as contact was made with American lines in this sector of Germany. He said that he was leaving a Russian Colonel in charge of the camp, and that all our needs would be satisfied, but that no one was to leave the camp without a pass. I asked him for a pass in order to round up any Americans who were in working groups in or near Neu-brandenburg. This he readily granted.

The old French priest came over and asked me to go downtown with him, for he wanted to see how the German priest and the German people who had not fled were making out. I certainly admired the old man's courage; he apparently feared no one. Expecting the worst, we were still shocked beyond words by what we saw. Just a few yards into the woods from the camp we came across a sight that I shall never forget. Several German girls had been raped and killed; some of them had been strung up by the feet and their throats slit. Some Americans had told me about this, but I had found it too difficult to believe. We paused to say a few prayers. When we arrived at what was once the beautiful little city of Neu-brandenburg, I had the feeling that I was looking upon the end of the world and Judgment Day. I almost expected to see the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse come galloping toward us.

Most of the buildings were still burning, and the streets were piled high with the debris of fallen walls. A large group of Germans, men, women and children were clearing the main street under guard of a Russian girl. Other Russian girls were directing

the traffic of the tanks and armored vehicles moving through the city. Bodies in the streets were ignored, unless they were in the way and obstructed traffic. In places the stench of burnt flesh was horrible. The old priest said nothing, but he would sigh deeply now and then when we met some new horror. He seemed to me at the time as a sort of a symbol of the Church in a devastated world as he lifted his cassock to climb over the debris, and as he stopped by each body to say a short prayer.

We finally arrived at the church rectory and went in. The house had been partly destroyed by fire, and completely wrecked inside. The priest's two sisters, both nuns, and his mother and father had come to him for protection. The priest and his father were sitting on the steps, and were obviously in the state of extreme shock. The women were huddled together on a couch. One of the sisters spoke to the French priest, and told him that the three women had been violated by a group of Russian soldiers, and that their brother and his father had been forced to watch. The French priest asked them if there was anything he could do, though I doubted whether there was anything that anyone was able to do. They shook their heads. I judged that they were on the verge of losing their minds; they were certainly beyond tears, and beyond receiving any expressions of sympathy. A rosary hung from the fingers of the old woman, and as she sat there with her eyes closed I couldn't be sure that she was alive.

We took a different route back to the camp, and we spoke very little on the way. As we were coming up the hill we passed a wagon that had been overturned; it was one of those in which a German family had tried to get away from the Russians. The family had been killed, as was evidenced by the fresh dirt covering a space of the ditch by the wagon; I would say that there were five or six buried there. A German shepherd dog was lying by the wagon, and though we tried to coax him to get up and come with us, he only looked up at us as dogs do when they have been beaten. Looters had already gone through the family possessions. They hadn't bothered to take a little doll that lay among the scattered things, nor had they taken the old family Bible, which the French priest picked up and looked into. The Bible had several First Communion and Confirmation pictures pasted in, and there were many many names under the headings of baptisms, marriages, and deaths. My friend really looked his years now. He had always

been so cheerful and pleasant, with a young man's optimistic outlook on life, but now the long walk of the day and the horrible things we had seen made him look worn, old, and tired of life. I was very glad when we got back to the camp, for I was afraid that the old French priest was ill.

Every Russian soldier receives a ration of vodka every day, and some of them had been able to find some German liquor too, so the majority of them were pretty drunk most of the time. While in this condition some of them had taken groups of Americans into the woods and had stripped them of all their valuables. Especially did they prize the American wrist watches. Then they forced Americans to dig their latrines. Finally, several Russian soldiers came into the barracks where we had our sick, and forced our men to drink vodka with them, and demanded all their cigarettes. What I feared more than anything else was that some American might bust a Russian on the nose, and that the Russians, undisciplined as they were, might turn a machine-gun loose on the Americans. We had come too long a way to lose men now. I went down to see the Russian Colonel who was in charge of the camp, but found that he was drunk too. We were beginning to feel much less secure under the Russians than we had under the Germans, and were wondering what we could do about it.

On the 2nd of May an American Colonel, who had been in a Belgian camp near Berlin, arrived at the camp and took command of the American compound. He was astounded at the treatment we were receiving from the Russians. He protested vigorously, but it seemed that front line troops in the Russian army just weren't expected to be disciplined troops, and the danger to our sick and wounded became critical. On the 4th of May an American Captain drove up to the camp in a jeep. He received a rousing welcome from the men, for they thought that he would be leading trucks in to take us back to the American lines, from where, we felt sure, we could almost see the Statue of Liberty. However, the Captain was on a special mission and had a Russian and a German interpreter with him. The Colonel asked the Captain to take me back to the American lines with him, so that I could explain our situation to someone who could do something about it. The Colonel had strictly forbidden any American to leave the camp, for such were General Eisenhower's orders. But each day a couple of dozen would light out on their own to-

wards the American lines, which were about a hundred and fifty miles away. The whole American compound was becoming quite surly, and real trouble with the Russians seemed almost inevitable.

Once on the road, the Captain told me what his mission was. He had been sent in to pick up a German scientist before the Russians reached him. The German was a man of considerable importance, and the Captain was determined that nothing was going to stop him from doing what he was sent to do. The roads were terribly congested, with thousands upon thousands of liberated Poles and Serbs and French and Italians struggling to get back home. Sometimes the procession moved only a couple of miles a day, and sometimes it would be hopelessly stalled for hours. Every conceivable kind of contraption was used for transportation, and dead horses and dead humans lay uncovered along the road, with no one bothering to cover them. The Captain would sometimes leave the road and take to the fields, for the congested traffic was often impossible to cope with. We arrived at Neustrelitz, about forty miles south of Neu-brandenburg, and went directly to the address of the German that the Captain was after. The German lived in a first floor apartment, and after rapping at the door for some time we finally let ourselves in through a window.

We waited in the apartment for about four hours before our man finally showed up. The Captain stood behind the door as he inserted his key into the lock, and when the German stepped in he felt a forty-five stuck in his back. The interpreter told the German to get into the American uniform that had been brought along for this purpose. As the German complied he was told that he was going back to the American lines with us. He was greatly relieved at that, and said that he would be glad to co-operate in every way. I must confess that I was getting quite a schoolboy thrill out of my accidental participation in this adventure. But the whole thing impressed me as being even more "corny" than the usual Hollywood script.

The Captain thought that we might more quickly reach the American lines by going south through Berlin. However, when we arrived on the outskirts of that city it became clear to us that we would not get very far that way before our German friend would be interrogated by the Russian police, who were stopping

and questioning everyone. We turned around and headed northwest towards the Elbe river. Our first night we did not stop to sleep, but caught what catnaps we could by taking turns driving. The second night we stopped at an abandoned farm house, and hid the jeep in the barn. The German slept soundly all night, probably the first restful night he had had since the Russians took his little city. I was glad to see as we went through the towns that few if any had been as badly mauled and burned as had Neubrandenburg.

On the third day we met a group of ten American airmen who had been prisoners, and were now trying to get to the American lines. They had been having a rough time of it, and were mighty hungry. The Captain had a case of C rations in the jeep, and if this much maligned ration was never appreciated before it certainly was now. The Captain then stopped a large wagon that liberated Poles were using to get home in, and he hooked the wagon on to the back of the jeep. I protested taking the wagon from the Poles, but the Captain said that he would have a better chance of getting the German scientist back to the American lines if he were mixed in with these aircorps men, for as we approached the American lines Russian interrogation officers got tougher and tougher and passes were required. With only four of us in the jeep, the Captain explained to me, each of us would likely be questioned; but with a wagonload of men probably only himself and whoever was driving the jeep would be questioned. I felt very sorry for the Poles, but they were not as disheartened as I had expected they would be; apparently nothing could spoil their joy at their liberation.

We spent three days covering the last seventy miles of Russian-occupied territory. Every ten miles or so we were stopped by the suspicious Russian police. The Captain and myself would always go together to see the local Commandant to get a pass. This procedure usually involved drinking several vodka highballs with the Commandant, and discussing the various aspects of the war. We were very liberal with our compliments to the Red army's role, which always pleased the Russians very much, and the American army was always complimented in return. The British part in the war was generally treated with scorn by all Russians. We dared not refuse to toast Uncle Joe, President Roosevelt, General Eisenhower, and innumerable Russian general officers;

failure to respond to a toast is the gravest of social errors and an insult to a Russian. After the third or fourth such affair I wasn't quite sure whom I was toasting; my stomach felt like a ball of fire.

When we got within ten miles of Ludwiglust we were stopped again. What a headache it was to get a pass from the Commandant there. The Captain and I went up to see him about seven o'clock in the evening, but the Captain excused himself after about an hour, and left me with the interpreter to try to get the pass from the Russian Major. The Major had a couple of Russian girls with him, one of whom could speak a bit of English and seemed to be the one who made the decisions for him. Liquor of all kinds was flowing freely, and the table was loaded with fried chicken; very well cooked, too, I might add. The Major was almost too drunk to sign his name to the pass, which he was quite willing to grant. But the girl kept telling him not to, for she said that she didn't trust me. She gave me quite a going over in broken English, and said that she knew that I was not telling the truth. I never felt so inclined to strike a woman in my life, but restrained myself with the help of the chicken and perpetual toasts that the Major kept proposing. Finally, for no apparent reason, the girl gave the Major a pencil and told him to sign the pass, and my faith in the essential goodness of womankind was restored. She let me know, however, that I wasn't fooling her a bit. It was now after eleven p.m. Four hours had been spent with that weird couple and their chicken and liquor. I felt definitely the worse for the wear, and was afraid now that the Captain and the others might have gone on without me, presuming that I had been unable to get the pass. They were still waiting, however, and I breathed a grateful sight of relief.

We finally arrived at Ludwiglust, and were stopped for the last time at the bridge over the canal which separated the Russians from the American sector. The Russian guard stopped us there and demanded another pass to get to the American side; but the American guard started a discussion with the Russian guard, and while they were talking the Captain stepped on the gas and over we went to the American side. The guard became quite excited and shouted for us to come back, but Uncle Joe himself couldn't have accomplished that. The 82nd Airborne Division was occupying this sector, and we found that besides being one of the best

fighting outfits in the world they were the most hospitable. They also gave us the great news that this was VE day—that war in Europe was over at last.

The next day, after a big steak dinner, we were sent to Ninth Army Headquarters at Hildesheim. There I was able to contact the Ninth Army G2 and tell him the whole story of the situation at Stalag II A. He said that General Eisenhower had had reports similar to that from other Stalags, and that negotiations were under way to evacuate American prisoners of war immediately. The Captain turned his German scientist over to the G2, and we parted. The G2 fixed me up with a clean uniform and that evening I flew to Paris. American GI's had never looked quite so good to me before; it was a wonderful feeling to be among your own free men again.

In Paris I was given some pay and a seventy-two hour pass before I would entrain for Le Havre. I met a group of men from my outfit in Paris, and the way they welcomed me and treated me made me realize how much I had missed them. We spent the evening discussing the Regiment and all the changes that had taken place in it. I wanted to go back with them to Rheims where the Regiment was again stationed, but my orders stated that I was to report to Camp Lucky Strike near Le Havre, and would be shipped back to the States as soon as possible. This wasn't such a hard order to take, however, as I was (and still am) pretty home-sick. I sent a couple of notes back with these GIs to the Regimental C.O. and to Chaplain Engle telling them to be sure to hold my place in the Regiment open for me, for I fully intended to return to it. My short stay in Paris was very pleasant, and I had a fine room assigned to me in the best hotel in the city. I spent most of the three days visiting the famous churches and other places of interest, but the greatest pleasure was simply walking as a free man among free men.

Camp Lucky Strike was quite a place—a tent city housing the thousands of prisoners of war who kept pouring in from all parts of Europe. They went all out there to fatten us up before we returned to the States. We were given the opportunity to enjoy the luxury of a shower, and new uniforms were issued. The meals were tremendous, and were prepared better than any army food that I have ever had. You could have five meals a day if you could eat them, with chicken and steak being the chief items on

menus which invariably finished with pie à la mode. Eggnogs were passed out between meals. This may seem hard for you to believe, but I gained about thirty pounds in the two weeks that I was there. A couple of other priests who had been prisoners in other camps were at Lucky Strike too, and we all had a great time together.

We sailed May 26, and so far this voyage has been very rough but pleasant. The thought that each moment brings me closer to the greatest country on earth and to home and my family keeps me all hopped up. The effect is the same on the other passengers too (all prisoners of war, or "Kriegies" as we are called). The whole boat seems intoxicated with the joy of going home. I am celebrating Mass every day, and the attendance is very good. Apparently most of the men are mighty grateful to the Power that brought them through. I doubt if many will ever forget their experiences or the Providence that is making it possible for them to return to their families.

I think that I shall always hesitate to believe or to disbelieve war stories, for I know that GI's sometimes tell whoppers, but I also know that the incredible does happen. The past year and a half is already beginning to seem more like a dream than reality, and I suppose in time that I shall almost be able to forget it entirely. Right now I am quite confused and bewildered and staggered by the terrific price of this war in human life and suffering. History alone will establish, I suppose, whether the good that comes out of it all will bear some proportion to the tremendous cost. About all I can think of now is the peaceful and happy life of a parish assistant in some little Iowa town—busy with the school children, with Catholic Youth groups, with confessions, with daily Mass, and with preparing the Sunday sermon. God willing, that's for me.

(To be concluded)

FRANCIS SAMPSON

Des Moines, Iowa.

MISSION INTENTION

"Christian Treatment of Workers in the Missions" is the Mission Intention for the month of March, 1947.

SEVEN O'CLOCK

The convent door is on the latch. As I close it behind me, I hear the clock strike seven. The Sisters are waiting. Yes, I think, as I climb the stairs to the chapel, the Sisters are waiting. They spend a good part of their lives in waiting for, and waiting on, us priests. They wait for us in the morning as we come to give them Holy Communion or to offer their Mass. They wait for us in the class-room, with cathechism and class-roll opened and ready for us on the desk. They wait for us on their confession day. They wait for us to examine the altar boys and to read the report-cards and to order the candles and to wash the purificators.

As I hurriedly slip into surplice and stole, it is with a guilty consciousness of all the precious minutes I have wasted for the Sisters. The times I've kept them waiting through necessity could be counted on the fingers of two hands. The times I've kept them waiting through negligence and thoughtlessness would need computing on an adding machine. Few hours are so carefully planned, and no minutes so usefully expended, as those of the Sisters. And yet if someone must wait, if someone's schedule must be disrupted, well "the Sisters won't mind," is a phrase that settles everything.

One of the priesthood's baffling mysteries is how we dare to patronize these women whose sanctity, whose zeal, and often whose ability, far exceeds our own. Our facetious references to "the good nuns" or to "Mother Abbess" may inflate our ego, but there must be wincing in Heaven at the ingratitude of priestly hearts. If there were table-talk among the Saints, surely a high-ranking topic would be: "How do priests get that way?"

Certainly Sisters are human; impeccability is not one of their attributes. We can go farther and admit that sometimes superiors are lacking in prudence and judgment. That is evident. Only a highly imprudent superior would make a request, for example, where the choice must lie between Father's comfort and the Sisters' convenience. Only a foolhardy nun would hint that something should be done that Father hasn't already thought of; only a moron would expect Father to give a reason for decisions that to the uncharitable-minded might seem capricious and inconsistent.

My mind is not on the "O Sacrum Convivium" as I recite it. I am recalling that my own vocation (and that of many another priest) is due, under God, to the inspiration, the encouragement, and the prayers of nuns. Well do I know that my crowded church and busy communion-railing are due to no eloquence of mine; it is the long and weary class-room labor of bonneted heads that has breathed reality into the Christian life and sacraments. It's a wonderful feeling to have the boys doff their caps on the street with a "Good morning, Father"; it's most satisfying to have the garage man say, "Oh, no, Father, I wouldn't charge you for that"; it's very flattering to have the cop on his motorcycle say, "Sorry, Father, I didn't know it was you." Where did they learn their veneration for the priesthood? Not in the rectory office. Sister Euphemia taught them that in the fifth grade.

"Benedictio Dei Omnipotentis . . ." We priests, it would seem, need to see the Sisters as human beings with a family background and their own personal traits. They are not automatons without feelings or sensibilities. They do not claim to be saints. Successes are just as welcome to them, disappointments are just as keen to them, and praise is just as sweet to them, as to us. More so, in their circumscribed and (even though divinely) regimented life. For all their angelic gaiety as Father visits them in their recreation room, they just can't be superhuman all the time. They have their headaches, too. They have their black moments, and with no housekeeper or janitor to work it off on.

As I blow out the candles, I wonder what started me on this line of thought? Well, maybe my conscience can stand stirring, even if I haven't snapped at one of them lately. Today when I go into the school I must be sure to tell Sister Francelin how well she has the altar-boys trained; I must remark on the immaculate altar-linens to Sister Elmyra; I must compliment Mother Grace on the splendid discipline in her class-room. Leaving the chapel, I feel so paternally beneficent that I actually smile at Mother as she raises her head for a moment from her thanksgiving. I can see that she is puzzled, but she smiles bravely back. Father is always so right.

LEO J. TRESE.

Carleton, Michigan.

THE DIOCESAN PRIESTHOOD IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

The specifically distinctive position of a diocesan priest within the Catholic Church is that of a member of a definite sacerdotal brotherhood contained in the larger and fundamental fraternal unity of Our Lord's society. That brotherhood is his *presbyterium*, the company of the priests of his own diocese assembled around their bishop, their spiritual father and ruler, the center and the principle of unity in their sacerdotal community.

Such is the basic theological truth about the diocesan priesthood. As a result, the doctrinal theology of the diocesan priesthood consists in a detailed examination into and analysis of the revealed teaching about the *presbyterium*. Likewise, all that can properly be called the spirituality of the diocesan priesthood or the special supernatural direction and instruction for secular priests and seminarians preparing to receive a call to the diocesan priesthood must be founded upon a realization of the specifically corporate and fraternal character and obligations of the diocesan priesthood. The diocesan priest can serve Our Lord intelligently and effectively only in the measure that he realizes the duties and the privileges which are his by reason of his membership in the *presbyterium*.

THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH

The nature of this diocesan *presbyterium* can only be understood in the light of God's teaching about the constitution and the visible unity of the Catholic Church. The true Church of Jesus Christ is properly defined as the society of all those united in the baptismal profession of the same Christian faith and in the communion of the same sacraments under the leadership of their legitimate ecclesiastical pastors, and ultimately under the leadership of Our Lord's vicar on earth, the Roman Pontiff. As the one true society of Christ's faithful on earth, the Catholic Church has one and only one visible over-all organization. There is one and only one universal leader, with true and episcopal jurisdiction over all of that company within which alone men live as real disciples of Jesus Christ. That one visible head of the universal Church is the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, and, as

such, the vicar of Christ on earth. Under his leadership and in union with him the brotherhood of the apostles, the Catholic episcopate, can teach and legislate for the entire Church.

THE LOCAL CHURCH

At the same time, however, it is characteristic of and proper to the constitution of Our Lord's Church that it is also organized in various cities and districts over the face of the earth. These local Churches are not mere geographic or administrative divisions of the universal society. In each one of them the faithful are grouped around one man who speaks to them in the name of God, ruling and guiding and caring for this particular company of the faithful in virtue of his position as a member of the apostolic college. Thus the local Church, through and in its bishop, manifests in its own way the perfection and the mystery of the universal Church itself. In this manner the Church of God, and not merely what might be termed a subdivision of it, dwelt in Corinth and in Ephesus long ago, and lives now in the cities of the world. Unfortunately, this theology of the local Church is not very well developed in the ordinary seminary manuals. Even in the best of the modern treatises *de ecclesia Christi*, far too little space is devoted and far too little stress is placed upon the position of the residential bishop and of the individual diocese within the Catholic society.[1] The portions of ecclesiology generally most extensively treated in the modern texts are those sections, like the one about the prerogatives of the Roman Pontiff, which have been most strenuously attacked during the course of the Church's history. It is happily quite probable that this particular part of the tract *de ecclesia* will be taught more effectively in the schools as a result of the current discussion about the diocesan priesthood. The studies of such theologians as Archbishop Guerry and Fathers Thils, Masure, Martimort, and Lemaître[2] have necessi-

[1] Thus in the fifth edition of Billot's *De ecclesia Christi* (certainly one of the very best of the modern manuals), only eight of the 876 pages of text are devoted to the individual bishop in the Church. In general the older texts such as those of Hervé and Tanquerey are rather deficient in this teaching. More recent works, like those of Dieckmann, D'Herbigny, and Zapelena, are better.

[2] For a brief account of these writings the article "The Spirituality of the Diocesan Priesthood," published in last month's issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* (pp. 126-40), may be consulted.

tated an increased interest in and consideration of the revealed teaching about the local Church.

The local Church is of course the diocese or archdiocese. Within each diocese the bishop rules and directs Christ's family in his capacity as a member of the apostolic college headed by Peter. He is the father and the governor of His people. Within this Church the bishop speaks with the voice and by the authority of Our Lord Himself.

It is perfectly true that the individual residential bishop does not possess the charism of infallibility in his own right. It is also true that the individual local Church, headed by one of the apostolic college, is not indefectible. The doctrinal infallibility of the Church resides only in the successor of St. Peter, and in the apostolic college over which he presides. The accurate and inerrant presentation of Christ's message in the local Church results from the union of that Church, through its bishop, and in its individual members, with the infallible See of Peter, and through that See with the company of the apostolic college, united to Peter's successor and subject to him. The individual residential bishop possesses his episcopal and paternal authority over his own Church by reason of his union with the Holy Father and of his membership in the college of the apostles. Furthermore, because of the very nature of Christ's society, the Bishop of Rome has true and episcopal authority over the bishop and over each and every one of the faithful in the individual local Church.

THE EPISCOPATE

Nevertheless, in order to understand the constitution of the true Church of Jesus Christ, we must realize that it is not organized merely as one vast diocese. The individual residential bishops are not to be considered as subsidiary officials whose position in the Church is determined by merely human ecclesiastical constitution. Like the papacy, the episcopate is essential to the company of Christ's disciples because Our Lord Himself placed it there. The nature and the substantial powers of the episcopate are not in the Church, then, by reason of any conciliar or pontifical enactment, but because they are inherent in the constitution of the Church as this was established by Our Lord. Such offices as those of the vicar-general, the vicar-forane, and the chancellor have been brought into being by the power of human ecclesiastical

law. The visible head of the Church, acting alone or with the apostolic college of which he is the head, could disestablish or transform these positions at any time. Since it belongs to the divine constitution of the Church, however, the episcopal office can neither be abolished nor substantially modified by any power men have received from God within the society of the disciples.

It is precisely because God's Church in this world is both a monarchical and hierarchical or episcopal society that the organization of the faithful around the individual residential bishop constitutes something more than a territorial district or division of the city of God. Thus it would be inaccurate as well as untraditional to speak of a diocese as a branch or district office of Christ's kingdom. Actually any diocese of the Catholic Church is a really, though of course not absolutely, autonomous and a holy organization of Our Lord's disciples, the universal Church as it were in miniature. The social entity which we call a Catholic diocese is exactly the same type of company which St. Paul greeted as "the church of God that is at Corinth."[3] In that brilliant jewel of patristic literature, the *Prima Clementis*, the primatial See of Christendom speaks to a Catholic diocese as "the Church of God dwelling as a stranger at Rome to the Church of God dwelling as a stranger at Corinth."[4]

St. Ignatius of Antioch, an outstanding patristic exponent of the divine apostolic tradition about the local Church, the episcopate, and the diocesan priesthood, greets a Catholic diocese, "the Church most worthy of felicitation, existing in Ephesus of Asia" as "blessed with plenitude by the greatness of God the Father, predestined before the ages to be united always in constant and immutable glory, and chosen in true suffering by the will of the Father and of Jesus Christ our God."[5] He recognizes "the Church which is in Magnesia on the Maeander" as "blessed in the grace of God the Father in Christ Jesus our Saviour."[6] Another Catholic diocese, "the holy Church which is in Tralles of Asia," is hailed as "beloved of God, the Father of Jesus Christ, chosen and worthy of God, having peace in the flesh and in the spirit through the passion of Jesus Christ, our hope through our resurrection unto Him."[7]

[3] *I Cor.* 1:2; *II Cor.* 1:1.

[4] *Clementis ad Corinthios I*, int.

[5] *Ad Ephesios*, int.

[6] *Ad Magnesianos*, int.

[7] *Ad Trallianos*, int.

The local Church consists of the faithful of this territory gathered around their bishop. He is the father and the center of this family in Christ. "It is manifest," St. Ignatius writes to the Ephesians, "that one must look upon the bishop as upon the Lord Himself."[8] The basic theme of the ecclesiology of St. Ignatius is the truth that a real love for Our Lord must manifest itself in loyal and complete reverence for and obedience to the bishop. In no other writing outside of the inspired works of the New Testament is the expression of true Christian charity in the tremendous social solidarity of God's Church brought out more forcefully than in the letters of St. Ignatius of Antioch.

THE BISHOP AND THE PRESBYTERIUM

But, by divine institution, the bishop is assisted in the administration of his Church by a sacerdotal company, the *presbyterium*. This brotherhood is composed of priests chosen by the bishop and gathered around himself. The *presbyterium* is immediately subject to the bishop, and it has no function other than that of acting as the instrument of the bishop in the liturgical, doctrinal, and administrative direction of the diocese. The *presbyterium* must be reverenced and obeyed by the members of the Church, not because of any independent authority resident in this company or in its individual members, but simply and solely by reason of its association with and subjection to the bishop.

The bishop, and only the bishop, is the head and the father of the *presbyterium*. The law of the Catholic Church allows for various subsidiary commands within this company, but no person other than the bishop of the local Church can be considered the leader and ruler of the priestly group as such. The *presbyterium* is the sacerdotal brotherhood within which and over which the bishop presides. As a brotherhood, having no purpose of existence other than that of acting as the bishop's instrument, the *presbyterium* functions properly only when it shows the bishop a whole-hearted, loyal, and charitable obedience. The measure of the attachment God demands from the *presbyterium* is shown in the words of St. Ignatius who, in writing to the Ephesians, describes their "justly famous *presbyterium*, worthy of God" as "attuned to the bishop as strings to a harp."[9]

[8] *Ad Ephesios*, VI, 1.

[9] *Ibid.*, IV, 1.

The bishop belongs to this priestly company, not only as a member but as the head. Nevertheless, such is the fullness of the fellowship of the members of the *presbyterium* with their bishop that, in the traditional language of the Catholic faith, the bishop may refer to one of the members of a sacerdotal fraternity as his *συμπρεσβύτερος* or *compresbyter*. Two early examples of the employment of this terminology are to be found in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Ecclesiastical History*. Eusebius quotes a passage from the writings of Apolinarius, Bishop of Hierapolis, in which this anti-Montanist prelate refers to Zoticus of Otrous as his *συμπρεσβύτερος*, and some pages from the work of Dionysius of Alexandria, in which this great prelate gives the same designation to Maximus, a member of his own Alexandrian *presbyterium*.[10]

St. Ignatius of Antioch makes it perfectly clear that a group of the faithful cannot be considered as forming a local Church unless they have a priestly *collegium* organized around and subject to their own bishop.

> Let all respect the deacons as Jesus Christ, even as the bishop is also a type of the Father, and the presbyters as the *synedrion* of God and the college of apostles. For without these the name of Church is not given.[11]

It is highly important for an understanding of the diocesan priesthood's position in the Catholic Church to realize that the primitive Christians designated the priestly brotherhood gathered around the bishop of a local Church by the very word which St. Luke had employed as the Greek name of the Jewish association of the elders of the people.[12] The early Christian writers used not only the individual term *presbyter*, but also the corporate word *presbyterium*. The fact that they used the name of what was, in the Jewish community, a collegiate body, and the further fact that they continued to speak of the priests of the local Church as a *presbyterium*, as a definite social unit (while not employing any

[10] Eusebius cites the use of the word by Apolinarius in Book V, cap. 16, and the letter of Dionysius in Book VII, cap. 11. The Latin equivalent, *compresbyter*, is used frequently in this same sense by St. Cyprian.

[11] *Ad Trallianos*, III, 1.

[12] *Luke* 22:66 has *τὸ πρεσβυτέριον τοῦ λαοῦ* which the Vulgate translates as *seniores plebis*. *Acts* 22:5 has *πᾶν τὸ πρεσβυτέριον*, translated as *omnes maiores natu*.

such corporate designation for the deacons), constitutes a clear and positive indication that they considered the priests of the local Church as in a special way forming a brotherhood with their bishop and among themselves, within the larger Christian and supernatural family unity of the local Church.

This corporate character of the *presbyterium* within the local Church is brought out magnificently in St. Ignatius' letter to the Magnesians, when he urges them "to be strengthened in the commandments of the Lord and of the apostles . . . together with your most revered bishop and with the worthily woven spiritual crown of your *presbyterium* and with the godly deacons."[13]

Since the *presbyterium* is so closely associated with the bishop, the faithful of the local Church owe obedience to this priestly brotherhood. St. Ignatius writes thus to the faithful of Tralles.

> When you are subject to the bishop as to Jesus Christ, it is manifest to me that you are living not according to men but according to Jesus Christ, who died for us, that believing in His death you might escape death. And so it is necessary that (as your practice is) you should do nothing apart from the bishop and also that you should be subject to the *presbyterium* as to the apostles of Jesus Christ.[14]

When St. Ignatius employed his favorite comparison of the *presbyterium* with the apostolic college, he was not by any means teaching that these two sacerdotal brotherhoods were alike in power. The episcopate itself is a collegiate office, in the sense that the local bishop is a member of the same fraternity originally composed of the Twelve. The *presbyterium* of the individual local Church is subordinate to one of the members of the existent apostolic college. Nevertheless, St. Ignatius' analogy is correct and enlightening. The local Church is, as it were, the universal Church on a small scale. Within the local Church one man, and one alone, is divinely commissioned to rule in virtue of his own office. The *presbyterium* as a fraternity, and the individual members of this brotherhood as individuals, receive their commission and authority from him as the apostles did from Our Lord. The local bishop is in the place of Christ in the sense that he is the ultimate ruler within this local Church. For the same reason, St. Ignatius compares his position to that of God the Father.

[13] *Ad Magnesios*, XIII, 1. [14] *Ad Trallianos*, II, 1.

Follow the bishop as Jesus Christ follows the Father, and the *presbyterium* as the apostles. Reverence the deacons as God's command.[15]

In yet another place, St. Ignatius compares the *presbyterium* with the apostolic college, while he describes the bishop's place in the local Church by analogy with God's.

Take care to do everything in God's concord, with the bishop presiding in the place of God and the presbyters in the place of the *synedrion* of the apostles, and my most beloved deacons entrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ.[16]

Every member of the local Church is bound to be a source of consolation and comfort to the bishop, but this obligation rests with special force on those associated with him in his *presbyterium*. "Every one of you," says the letter to the Trallians, "especially the presbyters, should comfort the bishop for the honor of the Father of Jesus Christ and of the apostles."[17]

The unity of the bishop with the priestly brotherhood around him and with the deacons stands, in St. Ignatius' writing, as a sign of the unity of the Eucharist itself.

Take care to use one Eucharist; for there is one flesh of Our Lord Jesus Christ and one chalice in the unity of His blood, one altar, as there is one bishop with the *presbyterium* and the deacons, my fellow servants.[18]

According to St. Ignatius, the faithful were to achieve their salvation in obedience to the bishop and the *presbyterium*. "Obey the bishop as by the commandment, and likewise the *presbyterium*,"[19] he wrote to the Trallians. Perfection, he told the Ephesians, was possible only on the condition that they "should obey the bishop and the *presbyterium* with undivided mind."[20]

THE PRESBYTERIUM AND THE DIOCESAN PRIESTHOOD

These few citations will suffice to show, basically at any rate, what the *presbyterium* of a local Church is. Now the diocesan priest, whatever may be his actual assignment from his bishop, is essentially a member of his bishop's *presbyterium*. He belongs

[15] *Ad Smyrnaeos*, VIII, 1.
[16] *Ad Magnesianos*, VI, 1.
[17] *Ad Trallianos*, XII, 2.
[18] *Ad Philadelphenses*, IV, 1.
[19] *Ad Trallianos*, XIII, 2.
[20] *Ad Ephesios*, XX, 2.

to this definite priestly brotherhood, which he enters, according to the usual and normal process, by virtue of his ordination as a secular priest. At his ordination he solemnly promises his priestly fealty, his "reverence and obedience," to the diocesan bishop who is the only immediate father and ruler of his *presbyterium*.[21]

As a subject of his own bishop and as a member of the local Church, he belongs, like every other Catholic within the membership of the diocese, to that individual local fraternity within the Church universal. The local Church or the diocese is in itself an individual Christian brotherhood. But, within the local Church the *presbyterium* stands as yet another Christian fraternity, the council of those priests immediately associated with and subject to the diocesan bishop.

In this way his status within the Catholic Church differs from that of the priest who is a member of a religious order or congregation. The religious priest's immediate Christian and sacerdotal fraternity in Christ's Church is his own religious family, not the *presbyterium* of a diocesan bishop in a local Church. The regular promises his sacerdotal loyalty, his "reverence and obedience," not immediately to a local bishop but to the prelate who is his Ordinary by the fact of his membership in the individual religious society.[22]

Ultimately, of course, the obedience of the religious priest is given to a member of the apostolic college. The government of the true and visible Church of Jesus Christ is essentially apostolic. The individual religious community, like every other society or group within the Catholic Church, is subject either to the Holy Father or to one of the residential bishops, who, in union with the Vicar of Christ and subject to him, constitute the apostolic college. Still it is one thing to be a priest subject to apostolic authority as a member of a society immediately headed by a prelate who is not the bishop of a local Church, and it is quite another thing to be a priest whose position in the

[21] The *Pontificale Romanum* places the question: "Promittis mihi, et successoribus meis reverentiam et obedientiam?" on the lips of a bishop ordaining one of his own subjects a priest, and thus admitting a man into his own *presbyterium*. If the new priest is a secular but a subject of some other bishop the words "Pontifici Ordinario tuo pro tempore existenti" are used.

[22] A religious priest is required to promise reverence and obedience *Praelato Ordinario.*

Catholic Church is that of a member of a diocesan *presbyterium*, the sacerdotal family or brotherhood directly constructed around the local bishop to aid him in the administration of the local Church. Within the Catholic Church the diocesan priest and only the diocesan priest is properly and with complete accuracy designated as a member of a bishop's *presbyterium*.

Despite the fact that the theology of the *presbyterium* was formed and expressed in patristic literature long before the appearance in the Church of religious communities containing priests or of religious societies of priests, it remains perfectly and obviously true that the qualifications mentioned in writers like St. Ignatius as the essential characteristics of the *presbyterium*, qualities like the immediate association of this priestly fellowship with the bishop of the local Church and its immediate subjection to him, belong manifestly and certainly to the various diocesan priestly brotherhoods within the Catholic Church rather than the religious societies. This, of course, does not imply in any way whatsoever that the status of the diocesan priest within the Catholic Church is in any way more honorable or more perfect than that of his religious confrere. Such comparisons are all too frequently both offensive and theologically misleading. We must, however, recognize the fact that the priestly status of the diocesan priest in the Church of God is something quite distinct from that of the priest who is a member of a religious order or congregation. Both have received the sacerdotal character. Both are called upon by God to exercise their priestly functions as members of individual brotherhoods within the Catholic Church. The essential point of the matter is that the *presbyterium* of a local bishop is not exactly the same kind of a brotherhood as a religious congregation.

Thus (and this is the thesis around which all of the discussion about the spirituality of the diocesan priesthood revolves), the training and the direction of a diocesan priest ought not to be exactly the same as the training and the direction of a priest who lives as a member of a religious community. Neither should it be a training primarily destined for religious priests but with the parts dealing with the community life and the vows of the religious omitted. The diocesan priest lives as a member of a distinct priestly brotherhood. In God's plan of the Catholic Church he is not, and he must not be considered as, a solitary individual, living

in the Church apart from any immediate priestly brotherhood. The proper spirituality of the diocesan priesthood must take cognizance of the corporate and fraternal nature of the *presbyterium*, and must include the divine teachings through which a priest is instructed in the way to live in his *presbyterium* so as to please God and be of profit to the Church and thus attain his own perfection.

Unfortunately there is a real tendency on the part of some Catholics and even on the part of some priests to overlook the inherently fraternal character of the diocesan priesthood. The people who fall into this error come to imagine that community life in the sacerdotal ministry is something reserved, for all intents and purposes at least, to priests who are members of religious congregations. As a theory, such an attitude is the expression of an error about the nature of the Church itself, since by the constitution of the Church every priest is meant to perform his sacerdotal duties as a part of some immediate religious brotherhood. In its practical implications, however, such an attitude is an insufferable evil. The diocesan priest cannot live the kind of life which Our Lord and the Church expect from him unless he comes to realize his status as a member of a distinctive kind of Christian and sacerdotal brotherhood. As a matter of fact the diocesan priest leads a holy and perfect Christian life only to the extent that he shows an enthusiastic and supernaturally charitable loyalty towards the bishop who heads his *presbyterium*, acts with truly fraternal charity towards his brother priests in his sacerdotal company, and directs his efforts in such a way as to do his part in the corporate work of the *presbyterium* for the local Church. Should the diocesan priest fail to recognize the fact that he owes a real debt of brotherly charity to the other members of the *presbyterium*, he would miss the fundamental truth about his position in the Catholic Church. Unless he actually has this particular fraternal charity for his brothers in the priestly company, he is not living as a good diocesan priest.

It is a basic truth of Catholic teaching that loyalty to and love for Our Lord involve a genuine and powerful affection for the Church within which He resides. Antipathy towards the Church constitutes separation from Christ. Objectively, persecution of the Church which is His body is a persecution of Our Lord. Love for Him carries with it a real loyalty for His house.

Thus in the life of any Catholic, the supreme act of social and supernatural loyalty is due to the Church within which Our Lord dwells. This means a love for this society as it actually exists, a genuine loyalty to the visible head of the Church on earth and to the apostolic college associated with Peter in the guidance of Our Lord's society. God has so constituted His Church, however, that loyalty to the universal society necessarily involves genuine love, attachment, and obedience to the head of the local Church.

In other words, the Catholic Church is so constituted by God Himself that no man can be a good Catholic, a loyal disciple of Jesus Christ, without at the same time being a loyal member of his local Church and of his own parish. No Catholic is properly associated with and subject to Christ's Vicar on earth unless he is really loyal to and united with his own bishop in the bonds of the love of the brotherhood. This salient truth is brought out in the Vatican Council's constitution *Pastor aeternus*, the document containing the definition of the Holy Father's primacy of jurisdiction and of his infallibility. The Council quoted the words of St. Gregory the Great.

> My honor is the honor of the entire Church. My honor is the firm strength of my brethren. Then am I truly honored when the honor due to each and every one of them is not withheld.[23]

Because the relation of the *presbyterium* to the bishop is comparable with that of the apostles to Our Lord, and because the *presbyterium* is the priestly council given to the bishop by divine institution to aid him in his work of caring for his spiritual children, loyalty to the bishop of a local Church involves loyalty and obedience to the priestly brotherhood of this diocese. Since the *presbyterium*, under the bishop's direction, governs and cares for the people of the local Church in the various parishes of the diocese, loyalty to the bishop involves loyalty to the parish.

The special loyalty and affection which the diocesan priest is obliged to show to his own bishop, to the fellow members of his own *presbyterium*, to the people of his own parish and of his own local Church in no way detract from the charity due to the

[23] Cf. Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion symbolorum* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1937), n. 1828. The passage from St. Gregory is found in the *Epist. ad Eulogium*, Lib. VIII, cap. 30.

Church universal. The supreme inward bond of unity within the Catholic Church is charity. By the force of that charity, the Catholic loves all of his fellow Catholics as his brothers and sisters in God's house. There is, however, a real and requisite order to divine charity, according to which we are bound to extend a particular affection to those closest to ourselves. Actually then the diocesan priest is bound to show a special affection and loyalty to the two pontiffs who exercise immediate episcopal jurisdiction over and care for him in the name of Christ, the Holy Father and his local bishop. He owes a special affection of charity to the members of his own *presbyterium* and, of course, to all of those who like himself share in Christ's priesthood. He owes also a special debt of affection to the people his *presbyterium* is obligated to aid and to direct.

The great and supreme social loyalty remains, however, as something due to the Catholic Church itself. The loyalty to an individual community within the Church which would militate against the city of God as a whole would be a perversion, not a good. Thus the loyalty of the diocesan priest to his own *presbyterium* (and, for that matter the loyalty of a religious priest towards his own Institute), which would be detrimental to the interests of the universal Church would be an evil thing. The fact that such attachment can be abused in no way lessens the truth that the individual religious company, the congregation on the part of the religious priest, the *presbyterium* and the diocese on the part of the secular, must be given a special and genuine tribute of charitable affection.

Because the diocesan priest takes his place in God's Church as a member of his bishop's priestly company, Archbishop Emile Guerry has designated, as the basic points in the spirituality of the diocesan priesthood, the recognition of these three truths. The diocesan priest must realize the bond which unites him to his bishop, the spiritual father of his own priests. He must see the meaning and the purpose of the diocesan community into which he is integrated. He must understand the pastoral mission of the diocesan priesthood.[24] Only the sort of instruction which takes

[24] Cf. *La Maison-Dieu*, III, 82 ff.

these three dominant factors into consideration will serve as an adequate spiritual direction for the diocesan priesthood.

In other words, any proper training for the diocesan priesthood should include competent *theological* instruction about the *presbyterium* as a sacerdotal fraternity subject to the bishop, devoted to him and to his interests in all loyalty and charity, and about the local Church, over which the bishop presides as Our Lord's representative. Such instruction of candidates for the diocesan priesthood must be properly and completely theological, rather than merely exhortatory and emotional. In the imparting of this instruction, the teacher should use the scholastic method and should employ properly theological sources. Books of affective piety, written in the vernacular of two or three centuries ago, will not suffice.

The books of the New Testament, the writings of the Fathers of the Church, and the documents of the ecclesiastical Councils abound in information about the status and the responsibilities of the diocesan *presbyterium*. The men who are privileged to belong to such sacerdotal brotherhoods and the men who are preparing themselves to accept their bishop's call to enter one of them should be shown what the various *loci theologici* have to say about the position and the duties of the diocesan priesthood as such. To depict the secular priest as merely a priest without vows, to explain the *presbyterium* merely in terms of the religious life, is to obscure the content of Catholic theology and to neglect a manifestly important instrument of priestly sanctification. Such obscurity and such damage will inevitably follow if the teaching on the *presbyterium* is left out of the formal course of theology and relegated to the place of mere "spiritual reading."

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

THE PRIEST AND THE SEMINARIAN

Indirectly all the priests with whom an ecclesiastical student comes in contact, whether at home or elsewhere in vacation time, and especially the priests of his own diocese, are intended by God to be instruments of his sanctification.

—Cardinal Bourne, in *Ecclesiastical Training* (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd., 1926), pp. 68 f.

Answers to Questions

INDULGENCES OF THE WAY OF THE CROSS

Question: Two priests were recently discussing the indulgences that can be gained by the devotion of the Way of the Cross. Both agreed that by each performance of this devotion, presuming the presence of the required dispositions, a person can gain a plenary indulgence. But they disagreed on the subject of the extra plenary indulgence that can be gained by one who also receives Holy Communion. One contended that on any day that one communicates he can gain two plenary indulgences by making the Way of the Cross once. The other claimed that the extra plenary indulgence is granted only after one has made the Way of the Cross ten times, and then receives the Holy Eucharist. Which of these two views is correct?

Answer: Undoubtedly the first view is correct. One who makes the Way of the Cross on a day when he has received or is to receive Holy Communion can gain an extra plenary indulgence (besides the one attached to the Way of the Cross by itself) through the union of these two acts of devotion. Thus, the daily communicant can gain two plenary indulgences every day by daily making the Way of the Cross once.

It would seem that the priest who held the second view—namely, that the additional plenary indulgence can be gained by Holy Communion only after one has made the Way of the Cross ten times, irrespective of the number of times he has received the Holy Eucharist in the meantime—may have been led astray by an English rendering of the original decree expressed in this manner: "The faithful may gain another plenary indulgence, if they receive Holy Communion on the same day, or even within a month after having made the stations ten times." From this translation one might conclude that the clause "after having made the stations ten times" modifies both "on the same day" and "even within a month"—although the use of the comma after "day" would seem to preclude such an interpretation. However, the original Latin wording is quite clear: "Fidelibus qui . . . pium exercitium *Viae Crucis* . . . peregerint, conceditur . . . alia indulgentia plenaria, si eodem die quo memoratum pium

exercitium peregerunt, vel etiam si infra mensem ab eodem decies peracto ad sacram Synaxim accesserint" (*AAS*, XXIII [1931], 522). The position of the words "ab eodem decies peracto" makes it very clear that they refer exclusively to "infra mensem." Evidently, then, the additional indulgence for making the stations ten times and receiving Holy Communion is intended for one who did not approach the holy table on any of the days when he made the Way of the Cross, but does so within a month after he has completed the devotion ten times. The matter is well expressed by Fr. Bouscaren, S.J.: "The faithful . . . shall be able to gain . . . another plenary indulgence if they receive Holy Communion on the same day on which they have performed the said pious exercise, or within a month from the time when they have completed it ten times" (*Canon Law Digest*, I [Milwaukee, 1934], 436).

THE WORKINGMAN'S PRIVILEGE

Question 1: May the Catholic wife and children of a non-Catholic workingman avail themselves of the "workingman's privilege" in the matter of abstinence?

Question 2: If a member of a workingman's family dines in a restaurant on one of the days to which the indult is applied, may he or she eat meat?

Answer 1: It would seem that the Catholic members of the non-Catholic workingman's family could lawfully make use of the "workingman's indult." For, according to the terms of the indult, the members of the family, as well as the workingman himself, are the direct recipients of the favor. Hence, as long as the father of the family, whatever his religion, can be classed as a workingman, the members of his family may avail themselves of the dispensation in question.

Answer 2: Although the reason for extending the dispensation to the members of the workingman's family—the grave inconvenience imposed on a man of limited means if he were obliged to provide two principal dishes—is not verified when a member of his family eats in a restaurant, it would seem permissible to make use of the indult in such circumstances, on the grounds that the concession itself does not limit the use of the dispensation by the members of the family to those occasions when they are eating at the domestic table.

OUR STAND AGAINST THE CAMPAIGN FOR EUTHANASIA

Question: What points should the priest in the parochial ministry emphasize in giving instructions to his people on the Catholic attitude toward euthanasia—that detestable practice which is being advocated by so many non-Catholics at the present day?

Answer: The questioner has brought up a subject that demands the earnest attention of all Catholic priests in present-day America. A generation ago, who would have imagined that the proposal to put to death persons suffering from an incurable malady would ever be seriously discussed in our land? Yet, in recent years such a plan has received considerable support from not a few persons of great influence. There is an organization known as the Euthanasia Society of America, many of whose members are physicians. Several years ago the first president of this society, Charles Francis Potter, made this statement in reference to a bill which he hoped to have introduced in the various state legislatures and in Congress: "The passage of a euthanasia bill will permit many physicians to do openly and honestly the things that many of them are already doing—breaking the law by mercifully ending lives which hold nothing but suffering" (*New York Journal-American*, Jan. 18, 1938).

A group of fifty-four non-Catholic clergymen has recently supported a bill, intended for the New York State legislature, which would legalize voluntary euthanasia. According to the terms of this proposal, a judge would be empowered to grant euthanasia to any person of sound mind over twenty-one years of age, suffering severe pain from an incurable disease, provided the person himself asked for this mode of "release," and reliable physicians support the petition. Although the present bill is carefully worded to include only those who freely express a desire for a "merciful death," there are some advocates of euthanasia whose eventual plan is the killing off of all the incurably sick, irrespective of their own desire.

In view of the progress of this movement, priests should deem it their duty to instruct the faithful thoroughly in the Catholic attitude toward "mercy killing." The fundamental doctrine of the Church's teaching is that God alone has direct jurisdiction

over human life, so that only by His authorization may a person directly kill himself or another. This authorization is granted to the state to the extent that it may inflict death on convicted criminals and on the enemy in war (presuming the latter are waging an unjust war); and it is also extended to private individuals in as far as it may be necessary to protect their lives or other valuable possessions against unjust aggression. Apart from these cases (and abstracting from the case of direct inspiration from the Most High) anyone who directly and deliberately takes a human life, either his own or that of a fellow man, is usurping the authority proper to God.

The fact that a person is incurably ill or deprived of the use of reason furnishes no exception, for such a person still possesses the dignity of a human being, with all the rights and obligations connoted thereby. The fact that he is enduring great pain affords no justification for killing him, for his suffering is a part of God's plan, and affords an occasion of practicing virtue both to himself and to those who must take care of him. The doctrine of euthanasia, while masquerading as an application of sympathy and mercy toward mankind, is actually a grievous insult to human nature, inasmuch as it puts human beings in the same category with brute animals, which we kill when they are old and helpless.

Recently the world was shocked by the account of the millions of murders perpetrated by the Nazi government, the victims being men, women and children, judged to be a useless burden to the state—in many cases, merely because of their race or religion. Yet, the present proposal in the United States to legalize voluntary euthanasia is based on the same philosophy as that of the Nazi government, and every sensible person knows that, once this principle is admitted, an opening wedge is given to a repetition of the same practices of mass slaughter that occurred in Germany in the course of World War II.

These points should be brought out in a clear and detailed fashion in sermons and instructions, for our people daily associate with those who favor the legalization of euthanasia and consequently should be able to answer the specious arguments that are often adduced in support of this revolting pagan practice. An excellent summary of the Catholic attitude toward euthanasia

appears in the *Catholic Mind* for December, 1946, from the pen of Msgr. Robert E. McCormick, of New York.

INDULGENCES OF CHURCH UNITY OCTAVE

Question: What are the indulgences of the Church Unity Octave?

Answer: By a grant of the Sacred Penitentiary in perpetuity, issued on Dec. 10, 1946, the following indulgences were bestowed: (1) Those who, with at least a contrite heart, attend the exercises of the Church Unity Octave in any church or public oratory on any of the days between the feast of the Chair of St. Peter (Jan. 18) and the feast of the Conversion of St. Paul (Jan. 25) can gain an indulgence of 300 days. (2) Those who make the entire Octave of prayer can gain a plenary indulgence under the usual conditions (confession, Holy Communion, visit to a church or to a public or semi-public oratory, prayer for the intention of the Holy Father).

The approved prayer for Church unity is as follows:

Ant. That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me and I in Thee; that they also may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou has sent Me.

V. I say unto thee that thou are Peter.

R. And upon this Rock I will build My Church.

Let us pray

O Lord Jesus Christ, who hast said unto Thine apostles: Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you, regard not our sins, but the faith of Thy Church, and grant unto her that peace and unity which are agreeable to Thy will. Who livest and reignest God forever and ever. Amen.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

THE OBLIGATION OF THE COMMUNION CLOTH

Question: Is it sinful to neglect using a Communion cloth? Is it permissible to dispense with the Communion cloth inasmuch as it would lessen the metallic beauty of the Communion railing?

Answer: Liturgy, *qua talis*, does not concern itself with the sinfulness of failing to observe the legislation of the Church

regulating ceremonial worship. It is certainly the correct thing to employ a Communion cloth, which emphasizes the idea of the Holy Eucharist as a *Sacrum Convivium*. We do not think that such a linen cloth would detract from the artistic design of a Communion railing since the latter is a token representation of the holy banquet table and, moreover, the Communion cloth need not be a permanent appurtenance of the railing but may be spread only when needed, at the distribution of Holy Communion. Though custom has banished the cloth in many places, the use of it is still prescribed by the Missal (*Rit. serv.* X, 6) and the Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of the Discipline of the Sacraments, of March 26, 1929, prescribing the use of a Communion paten evidently presumes that the Communion cloth is to be used also, the plate being an additional precaution. Risking an *excursus* into the field of morals, we are of the opinion that while the white cloth is most correct, in view of the general practice, it would not be seriously sinful to dispense with it.

THE ABLUTIONS IN BINATION

Question: The instructions for binating seem meaningless. The consuming of the ablutions would seem to your enquirer as completing the sacrifice. Why should taking them be considered breaking the fast? When the chalice is left on the altar after the first Mass, it often happens that one forgets to put a host on the paten so there is a delay at the offertory of the next Mass while a host is being sent for. Why not purify the fingers and the chalice at the first Mass in the usual way and carry it out at the second Mass as though this were the only one celebrated by the priest?

Answer: The ablutions are not *de integritate sacrificii* but supplementary actions which are precautions against the loss of minute portions of the Sacred Species. All moralists are agreed that the consumption of the ablutions constitutes breaking of the required eucharistic fast. Though the faculty of binating is in the nature of a privilege, the restrictive prescriptions as to the manner of procedure are of obligation. They are based on the rubrics of the Missal governing the trination on Christmas Day, which were, in 1915, extended to the three Masses permitted to be celebrated by the same priest on Nov. 2. Moreover, these regulations were made part of the instruction of the Sacred Con-

gregation of Rites, dated March 11, 1858, detailing the manner of acting with respect to the ablutions in the case of bination. This instruction may be found in the first appendix to the Ritual. As to the likelihood of forgetting to place the host on the paten if the official procedure is observed, there is no guarantee that an absent-minded priest would unfailingly provide the host even if the ablutions were taken in the first Mass of a bination.

DALMATICS OR FOLDED CHASUBLES ON FEB. 2, 1947?

Question: This present year of 1947, Feb. 2 coincided with Septuagesima Sunday. I understand that the blessing of the candles was to take place as usual, though the feast of the Purification of our Lady was transferred to the following day. If folded chasubles were worn by the deacon and subdeacon for the ceremony of blessing the candles, should they have changed to violet dalmatics for the Mass following?

Answer: Folded chasubles are worn by the sacred ministers for the blessing of the candles and the procession following it on Feb. 2, whether that day is a Sunday or a week-day. Ordinarily, the Mass is that of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin, for which white vestments are worn, the deacon and subdeacon therefore exchanging their violet folded chasubles for white dalmatic and tunic. If, however, as was the case this year, Feb. 2 is one of the three Sundays preceding Lent, violet remains the color of the Mass but dalmatics, not folded chasubles, are the proper vestments for the sacred ministers. So, after the procession, the deacon and subdeacon should have removed the folded chasubles and put on the violet dalmatics (cf. Martinucci, *Lib.* II, *cap.* xix, 6).

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

PASTOR AND TEACHER

The Apostle of the Gentiles enumerates the titles of pastor and teacher among those of a priest. He joins together these two qualifications in order to point out the intimate and inseparable union between the office of pastor and that of teacher, and to remind us that the shepherd of souls must, also, be a man of learning.

—Cardinal Gibbons in *The Ambassador of Christ* (Baltimore: John Murphy Co., 1896), p. 165.

Analecta

The ninth number of the thirty-eighth volume of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* reports the formal words of our Holy Father in proclaiming the solemn canonization of Mother Frances Cabrini as well as his homily on that occasion.[1]

Two letters of our Holy Father are also reported, both congratulatory: one, dated June 2, 1946, sent to John Cardinal de Jong, Archbishop of Utrecht, on the occasion of a national assembly in Amsterdam commemorating the sixth century of the Eucharistic miracle in that city;[2] the other dated June 5, 1946, sent to the Superior General of the Augustinians, commemorating the fifth centenary of the canonization of St. Nicholas of Tolentino.[3]

Two radio messages of our Holy Father are printed in this number of the *Acta:* one, dated June 30, 1946, delivered to the throng assembled in Sucre at the National Eucharistic Congress of Bolivia;[4] the other, also dated June 30, 1946, delivered to the people assembled in Liège, Belgium, commemorating the seventh centenary of the institution of the Feast of Corpus Christi in that Diocese.[5] In the former, our Holy Father assures the Bolivians of his prayers that the love derived from the participation of the Eucharistic Table may continue to unite them in a peace so admirably symbolized by the name of the capital of their country and that it may bear fruit in the amelioration of the lot of the Indian, in the elevation of family life, in a deepening of religious living, and in the intensification of the sanctity of the priesthood. In the latter, he points to the glorious theme of the Apocalypse, the Lamb of God, and offers it to the assembly as the summary of their past blessings, as well as the hope and assurance of those that are to come. In both, he extends to bishops, priests, and people his Apostolic Blessing.

In the same number, a decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments, dated Jan. 28, 1946, provides for an organization of

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXVIII (1946), 270.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 273.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 274.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 276.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 278.

the ecclesiastical tribunals of Canada.[6] Henceforth, all cases involving the invalidity of marriages are to be heard in first instance before designated Metropolitan tribunals. All the latter are constituted courts of first instance for two provinces except those of Montreal and Ottawa, which are restricted to cases arising in their own province. On appeal, Montreal hears cases tried in Quebec and Toronto; Ottawa, those tried in Montreal; Quebec, those tried in Ottawa and Halifax; and Toronto, those tried in Regina and Vancouver. Under the date of May 13, 1946, the Sacred Congregation issued norms for carrying into effect the aforesaid decree.[7] They are arranged in twenty-one articles and four chapters dealing with court personnel, procedure, stipends of court personnel, and costs of court and advocates. Five temporary norms are appended affecting pending cases.

Under date of May 21, 1945, the Sacred Congregation of Rites issued a decree, reproduced in the present number of the *Acta*,[8] declaring that the practice of the requisite virtues had been established in the case of the Venerable Servant of God, John Martin Moyë, priest of the Parisian Society of Foreign Missions and Founder of the Sisters of Providence. The decree recites that he was born Jan. 27, 1730, in the town of Cutting in the Diocese of Metz, now the Diocese of Nancy; that he was ordained March 9, 1754; that after serving as a curate for some years, he was made rector of the seminary; that in 1762 he founded the Sisters of Providence; that in 1769 he joined the Parisian Society of Foreign Missions; and that he labored from 1772 till 1782 in the Vicariate Apostolic of Sut-chuen, whence he returned to his native land, dying May 4, 1793, at Trèves, whither he had fled from the fury of the French Revolution.

Under date of June 1, 1946, the same Sacred Congregation issued the additions and variations to be made in the Mass and Office of St. Anthony of Padua and in the martyrology of June 13, occasioned by the elevation of the latter to the dignity of a Doctor of the Church.[9]

Under date of June 4, 1946, the Holy Office declared the priest, Ferdinand Tartaglia, *excommunicatus vitandus*.[10]

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 281.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 283.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 287.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 291.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 280.

RECENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS ANNOUNCED IN THE *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*

Privy Chamberlains Supernumerary of His Holiness:

Nov. 17, 1945: Very Rev. Msgrs. John K. Clarke, Patrick J. Dignan, James E. Dolan, Fidencio E. Esparza, and Michael F. O'Connor, of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

Feb. 20, 1946: Very Rev. Msgrs. George Dreher, Mark S. Ebner, Charles E. Helmsing, John W. Marren, John J. Martin, John S. Moser, Edward H. Prendergast, Rudolph B. Schuler, and Henry E. Stitz, of the Archdiocese of St. Louis.

March 1, 1946: Very Rev. Msgrs. John Schmid, William Gorman, John Fitzgerald, Eugene Mulcahey, Matthew Cummings, and Martin Hayden, of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

DR. THILS ON THE SACRAMENTAL CHARACTER OF CONFIRMATION

What is the effect of Confirmation? A theological reflection based upon the doctrine about the sacraments invites us to conclude that the person confirmed obtains, through the sacramental character, a participation in the power of Christian worship. But in what sense? Does this give him the power to perform certain rites validly? Apparently not. His action has reference to the nature and the value of the profession of Christian faith. Christ, who has not based the validity of His sacraments on the possibility of virtuous dispositions on the ministers' part has certainly not made the defence of truth subject to the good dispositions of the individual either. Does not the Mass of the ordained priest validly glorify God because it draws its fundamental efficacy from Christ the Mediator and because the priest is only an instrument in His hands? In the same way the profession of faith, the proclamation of the truth and the holiness of Christianity, coming from a confirmed person, are certainly and authentically real and agreeable to God because their basic values come from Christ. At such a moment the confirmed person is only the instrument of Christ and his voice is powerful in the Spirit.

—Dr. Gustave Thils in *Nature et spiritualité du clergé diocesain* (Bruges: Desclée, De Brouwer, 1946), p. 209.

Book Reviews

MORALS IN POLITICS AND PROFESSIONS. A GUIDE FOR CATHOLICS IN PUBLIC LIFE. By Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1946. Pp. 187. $2.50.

This is a book which could have been written only by a Catholic for Catholics. If such a work were attempted by one outside the household of the faith, it would today almost necessarily be tinged in its premises by skepticism. Its conclusions would similarly be touched by the current polite amiability which would not insist upon the fulfilment of obligations which are difficult or irksome.

The author makes it quite clear that there are inescapable moral obligations attached to certain states of life. The subtitle: "A Guide for Catholics in Public Life," sets forth the *noblesse oblige* which he develops within the framework of justice. Legal justice, commutative justice, distributive justice, social justice are all given, not merely in their definitions but in terms of immediate application to definite problems. *"Justitia . . . dum ruat coelum"* may well be taken as the author's guiding principle.

In many of our older manuals of Moral Theology, we are accustomed to find at the conclusion of each tract a summary entitled *nota pro praxi* in which speculative principles are given their application. Dr. Connell's work may be regarded as a *nota pro praxi* expanded to the compass of a very readable and thoroughly useful book.

There is need of such writing and thinking today. Moral Theology has need not merely of scientific and speculative works, but likewise of those which are scientific and practical—which show Moral Theology as an art—the *ars artium.* For the past half century and more scholars have tended to emphasize the speculative side of Moral Theology, and it is timely that one of Dr. Connell's undoubted attainments should publish for this generation so eminently practical a manual.

While we may well say that every Catholic is in public life, inasmuch as he bears public witness to his faith, there are some who in a special sense need the constant guidance of Catholic truth. It is to these that Dr. Connell addresses himself, to these and to their confessors and directors. Catholics in public life have constantly to face moral problems which are proper to their several responsibilities.

Relative to those in political life, Dr. Connell sets forth three qualifications, which, *mutatis mutandis,* he would exact of everyone in whose occupation there is vested some public charge. These are "the requisite knowledge, moral integrity, and the willingness to accept

the office." Dr. Connell goes on to say "Unfortunately too many political candidates . . . possess only the third of these requirements" (p. 2).

The standard of conduct which is proposed for those in public life is a high one. The ideal of Grover Cleveland, "A public office is a public trust" is uncompromisingly set forth in these pages. The author recognizes that not a few of those in political life who bear the Catholic name have not shown themselves worthy of the confidence of the electorate. "It is no effective rebuttal," to quote Dr. Connell, "to assert that many non-catholic officials also are guilty of dishonest transactions. This fact is quite true, but it furnishes no adequate reply to the objection, since Catholics should be better than other people" (p. 4).

It is not necessary that the author document his case in this regard. Perhaps nothing has been a source of more anxiety and soul-searching on the part of pastors of souls than the evident unworthiness of some Catholic leaders in political life. These leaders show themselves at a disadvantage even in comparison with many who profess no religious belief, but in whom the vestiges of natural virtue are to be found. Dr. Connell suggests practical remedies, viz. adequate exposition on the college level of the Catholic philosophy of government, a joint effort on the part of priests and laity to root out corruption from public life, and the encouragement of able and honorable young Catholics to enter upon careers of public service. It is a program which commends itself the more especially in view of the increased importance of the state and its leaders in our doing and thinking. The day of individualism, rugged or otherwise, seems to have passed.

The Catholic legislator and the Catholic judge face few problems which would not confront any legislator or judge informed by the natural law alone. They are officials of all the people, and not merely of a Catholic percentage, yet they cannot bring to bear upon the question before them a conscience which is merely neutral and indifferent. The Catholic legislator must be prepared to face the accusation of being partisan to his own faith, since he follows its principles. However, he must be equally prepared, as a public official, to give with even justice to every denomination, in keeping with American tradition.

The Catholic judge too is faced frequently with vexing problems of conscience. He may be beset by those to whom he is under obligation to render judgment independently of the evidence. He may wonder to what extent his professional obligations can elicit the sacrifice of personal convenience or interests. In the field of domestic relations, he is called upon to take under advisement questions of separation and divorce, in which the parties at interest may be Catholics

bound by the Church's law. In Dr. Connell's book these questions are set forth and answered. The solutions are not given abstractly, but with evident recognition of the consequence which may attach for the individual. Justice is not always popular.

The police officer has many problems similar to those just mentioned. In their solution Dr. Connell brings to bear two principles which constantly recur in his work. These are: first, our contribution to the life of America is enriched rather than impeded by membership in the Catholic Church; and secondly, that when, in a given case, the moral law is clear, no contrary custom or tradition may abridge its complete enforcement. These principles are axiomatic, of course, but even axioms profit by repetition. Dr. Connell does not shrink from pointing out the hard sayings and showing why they must be uttered.

One chapter that may well arouse discussion is that which deals with the duties of the Catholic soldier or sailor. Here is a field in which in the years ahead there will be much writing and discussion, given the recent radical changes in the nature of warfare. Dr. Connell has no doubts as to the immorality of total war. For that matter, no one in a position of responsible leadership made vocal any doubts in this regard in 1939. It is a measure of our retrogression that the question should now seem most urgent.

In keeping with his searching analysis of the weaknesses of our American public life, Dr. Connell devotes two chapters to the question of dishonesty and graft in politics. Not content with condemning these evils, Dr. Connell sets forth lucidly the reasons why they are evil, particularly in relation to the demands of justice. The obligation to restitution is stressed in each of the many variants of civic dishonesty which the author proposes for our consideration. In repetition of a motif mentioned above, he says, "In the United States, where graft is so common a feature of public life, Catholic officials must be disabused of the idea that dishonesty is permissible to them 'because everybody is doing it.' Even if it were true that everybody else is doing it, Catholics would have to be different" (p. 90).

In a chapter entitled "Deceiving the Public" many questions are raised which are recognizably current. May one mislead the people through false campaign promises, through a vile or venal press, or through advertising? The "right" to deceive through advertising seemed to many, up to a short time ago, at least, almost part of the Bill of Rights itself. The author aptly makes the point that "truth in advertising" with which the Federal Trade Commission has so much concerned itself is quite in keeping with the teachings of Catholic moralists.

The Catholic lawyer, doctor, nurse, teacher, and social worker and

their problems are given adequate, and at times detailed treatment. Here the existence of codes of ethics adopted by professional associations, and the growth of specifically Catholic organizations within these professions have made the imperatives of proper conduct familiar. At the same time it must be recognized that there are questions, such as those of euthanasia and therapeutic abortion, which are eternally settled, so far as the divine and natural law are concerned, but which are none the less matters of everyday concern. The clear and unmistakable enunciation of Catholic doctrine here given in these and many other matters constitutes a real service not only to Catholic scholarship, but to the clergy and faithful generally.

Most of these chapters appeared originally as a series of articles in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*. Now reprinted, and with a good index, it is easy to see in them the evidences of a broad scholarship and an easy familiarity with the sources of Moral Theology. Such a background makes it possible for Dr. Connell to indicate confidently the solution to problems of conduct which at first glance may seem to be guided by no clear directive of natural or divine law. The work deserves a wide public in keeping with its wide usefulness.

MSGR. EDWARD G. MURRAY

EXILE IN THE STARS. By James J. Donohue. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1945. Pp. 56. $1.50.

This is no book for the man who both loves his Breviary and appreciates good poetry: it will enmesh such a man in endless efforts to produce with equal excellence any one of the 364 possible books that may come after this one. James Donohue has taken the entire Office for the First Sunday of Advent, and fashioned from the ideas thereof a poetic work that has rare strength and flavor.

The entire frame of the Office is retained, even down to the Little Chapters. Still, this is no bare translation; neither is it a paraphrase. Each unit of the day's Office has been returned to its place with its thought transformed, enriched, and burnished by the skill of a workmanlike poet who knows his art and the potentialities of his material.

This is a good book for the man who savors the Liturgy, the man who bends both intelligence and emotion to the effort of adoring God through the Office. It is a good book as well for the man who wants to see the beauty that lies beneath the surface of language, in the strata of ideas. It is a book that will help anyone to get beneath the Vulgate and come to an appreciation of the beauty of the ancient psalms and lessons that we daily use in praising God.

PATRICK O'BRIEN, C.M.